DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 091 313 SP 005 388

AUTHOR	Bagley, Ayers, Ed.
TITLE	Responding to the Power Crises in Teacher Education.
INSTITUTION	Society of Professors of Education, Washington, D.C.
PUB DATE	71
NOTE	107p.; Papers and abstracts of papers presented at the Conference of the Society of Professors of Education (Chicago, Illinois, 1971)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.75 HC-$5.40 PLUS POSTAGE
DESCRIPTORS	Abstracts; *Conferences; Foreign Countries; *Historical Reviews; Professional Associations; Speeches; *Teacher Education; *Values

ABSTRACT

This document presents the texts of papers delivered at the 1971 meeting of the Society of Professors of Education. These papers are as follows: "Power Conflicts and Crises in Teacher Education: Some Historical and International Perspectives," by William W. Brickman; "Expectations vs. Reality: Behavioral Science Response to Teacher Education Demands," by Don C. Charles; "Value Conflicts, Rights and Teacher Education," by Joe Park; and "The Phenomenological Crises in Teacher Education," by Van Cleve Morris. Also included in this document are abstracts of papers delivered at the same Chicago conference by the following organizations: American Educational Studies Association (on general educational topics); Comparative and International Education Society (on educational problems in other countries); and History of Education Society (on men and events). (JA)

ED 091313

RESPONDING TO THE POWER CRISES IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Society of Professors of Education
Major Papers and Abstracts of the 1971 Conference
Chicago, Illinois

Ayers Bagley
Editor

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS COPYRIGHTED MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY
AACTE
TO ERIC AND ORGANIZATIONS OPERATING UNDER AGREEMENTS WITH THE NATIONAL INSTITUTE OF EDUCATION. FURTHER REPRODUCTION OUTSIDE THE ERIC SYSTEM REQUIRES PERMISSION OF THE COPYRIGHT OWNER.

SP005388

Copyright 1971 by
Society of Professors of Education
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D. C. 20036

CONTENTS

I

SOCIETY OF PROFESSORS OF EDUCATION

Page

Power Conflicts and Crises in Teacher Education: Some Historical and International Perspectives
William W. Brickman. 1

Expectations vs. Reality: Behavioral Science Response to Teacher Education Demand
Don C. Charles 29

Value Conflicts, Rights and Teacher Education
Joe Park 47

The Phenomenological Crisis in Teacher Education
Van Cleve Morris 64

II

AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL STUDIES ASSOCIATION

Standardized Testing in Schools and Colleges: Uses and Misuses
John Paul Eddy 75

Consciousness III: Obstacle or Opportunity?
Maxine Greene 75

A Typology of Big City Elementary Schools
Russell C. Doll 76

Using Novels in Educational Foundations
Kent L. Johnson 77

Two Learner-Centered Experiential Approaches to Teacher Foundations of Education
Gene Sullivan 78

Education: An Interdisciplinary Discipline
Joseph L. Braga 80

Experiencing Foundations of Education
Val Rust 82

American Public Education As An Institution of Social Control
Yale Lee Mandel 83

Another Renaissance:
Claire L. Gilles 84

Page

Education As Psychotherapy
Elmer N. Lear 85

The "Black Status" of Teacher Education in Academia
Jack K. Campbell 86

Some Additional Questions for Foundations of Education
Janice Farmer Weaver 87

Anthropidiology: A New Discipline
Phillip T. McClung 88

III

COMPARATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION SOCIETY

A Model for the Development of Middle-Level Skilled Manpower in Emergent Nations
Susanne M. Shafer 90

The Fallacy Concerning the Outcome of Comprehensive Education As a Political Issue in Great Britian
Stephen P. Heyneman 90

A Comparative Study of Urban and Rural Teacher Roles in a Changing Society: Lebanon
Suzanne Howard 92

The University Professor in Latin America: A New Look at an Old Stereotype
Richard Pelczar 93

Ties Between American Educational Pragmatism and the Soka Gakkai Movement of Japan
Dayle M. Bethel 95

IV

HISTORY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

Men and Events: William Wirt, The Bluffton Years
Walter H. Drost 96

Thomas McCulloch and the Pictou Academy Controversy: Man and Events Assessed
J. Bruce Ronald 96

Events and the Man: George S. Counts and Dare the School Build a New Social Order?
Gerald L. Gutek 97

Events and the Man
Maxine Greene 98

I

SOCIETY OF PROFESSORS OF EDUCATION

POWER CONFLICTS AND CRISES IN TEACHER EDUCATION: SOME HISTORICAL AND INTERNATIONAL PERSPECTIVES

William W. Brickman

Professor of Educational History and Comparative Education, Graduate School of Education, University of Pennsylvania; Editor, *School and Society*

To a pacific person, the terms *power*, *conflict*, and *crisis* imply a near-martial tone. When these words were foisted upon me (a power play in itself), the initial impulse was disassociation from any title even remotely suggesting bellicosity. After brooding over the theme and carefully weighing my displeasure at the entrenchment of the sociopolitical terminology among my colleagues, I shook myself loose from educational ethnocentrism and began to recall some of the publications of the past decade or two which hinted at squabbles and struggles in academia and society. The first to come to mind was Wiggins' *Battlefields in Teacher Education.*[1] A quick check of the memory, the bookshelves, and the bibliographies revealed such works as *Teacher Education: Who Holds the Power?* and *The Conant Controversy in Teacher Education.*[2] The pertinence of the topic was convincing.

It seems logical to begin by trying to define the key terms as used by political and other social scientists. In his article on power in the newest reference work in the social sciences, Dahl states that " . . . most political theorists took it for granted, as did Aristotle, that key terms like *power*, *influence*, *authority*, and *rule* (let us call them 'power terms') needed no great elaboration, presumably because the meaning of these words was clear to men of

---

[1] Sam P. Wiggins, *Battlefields in Teacher Education* (Nashville, Tenn.: George Peabody College for Teachers, 1964).

[2] Harold L. Clapp and James D. Koerner, *Teacher Education: Who Holds the Power?* (Washington: Council for Basic Education, 1963); Robert M. Weiss, *The Conant Controversy in Teacher Education* (New York: Random House, 1969).

common sense."[3] More helpful was Weber's definition of *Macht (power)* as ". . . the probability that one actor within a social relationship will be in a position to carry out his own will despite resistance, regardless of the basis on which this probability rests."[4]

The definition of conflict varies with the discipline. To a psychologist, "conflict refers to a situation in which a person is motivated to engage in two or more mutually exclusive activities."[5] According to a political scientist, "a conflict emerges whenever two or more persons (or groups) seek to possess the same object, occupy the same space or the same exclusive position, play incompatible means for achieving their purposes."[6] A sociologist sees social conflict as ". . . a struggle over values or claims to status, power, and scarce resources, in which the aims of the conflicting parties are not only to gain the desired values but also to neutralize, injure, or eliminate their rivals."[7] Finally, an anthropologist feels that "conflict is occasioned by incompatible desires or aims and by its duration may be distinguished from strife or angry disputes arising from monetary aggravations."[8]

It is difficult to find a suitable, concise definition of crisis, which is characterized by a political scientist as "a lay term in search of a scholarly meaning."[9] What emerges from several efforts at definition are such concepts as turning point toward change, a period of stress and anxiety, and a rise of tensions between persons or groups.

In this essay, *teacher education* will be used in the customary way to

---

[3]Robert A. Dahl, "Power," in David L. Sills, ed., *International Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* (New York:Macmillan, 1968), XII, 406.

[4]Max Weber, *The Theory of Social and Economic Organization*, edited by Talcott Parsons (Glencoe, Illinois: Free Press, 1957), 152, as quoted in Dahl, *Ibid.*

[5]Edward J. Murray, "Conflict: Psychological Aspects," in Sills, *op. cit.*, III, 220.

[6]Robert C. North, "Conflict: Political Aspects," in *Ibid.*, 225.

[7]Lewis A. Coser, "Conflict: Social Aspects," in *Ibid.*, 232.

[8]Laura Nader, "Conflict: Anthropological Aspects," in *Ibid.*, 236.

[9]James A. Robinson, "Crisis," in *Ibid.*, 510.

mean the process and program of preparing pedagogues. In addition, we feel free to broaden the term to include the conditions, image, emolument, and other factors which pertain to the instructors of children and adolescents.

Let us now glance at some instances of conflicts, crises, and power relationships in the teacher education of the past and of various societies, our own and foreign. Reference to a wider context than the contemporary and local may help us to see some of the problems of teacher education in another light than in that of our own immediate experience.

Anyone working on the issues of education is helped immeasurably by the historical surveys of Brubacher, in the present instance by this scholar's treatment of the professional education of teachers in the perspective of the past. Looking back over the centuries, he identifies several questions which were fundamental to the issue of the quality of teachers: mastery of subject content only or content plus training in methods of teaching; the image of teaching -- a random activity, a calling, or a profession; the socioeconomic status of the teacher; the prestige of the teacher in relation to the educational level of the pupils; state certification as a means toward the improvement of the quality of the teacher; and the functions of teachers' organizations in regard to the protection and improvement of the teacher's status and professional ability.[10] In a short paper, obviously, all these aspects of the teacher cannot be treated in sufficient depth. What is feasible, however, is a reinterpretation of some of the familiar conflicts and crises and an indication of a few of the lesser known problems in history. Hopefully others, and possibly the present writer too, will dig more deeply as time and space become more available.

It is probably a fact in the history of education that institutions, whether defined in familial, tribal, or scholastic terms, antedated the specific plans for the training of teachers. No doubt the religious teacher-functionaries,

---

[10]John S. Brubacher, *A History of the Problems of Education* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1966), second edition, 465-506.

or shamans, of the primitive tribes received some sort of training, in addition to the absorption of the traditional lore, as preparation for the execution of their important duties. This training was probably in the form of apprenticeship or in some informal manner. Under such circumstances, it is hard to imagine that the teacher in primitive times was other than well-qualified, adequately recompensed, and highly esteemed.

These conditions prevailed in some, but certainly not in all, ancient societies. The teacher's position in early China was "exalted and honorable,"[11] as it generally was in India, Judea, and the Islamic world. Elsewhere it appears to have been sharply ambivalent. Even if the paidagogos in Greece was not exactly a teacher, he exercised some educational functions but, however learned he may have been, he was not usually regarded or treated on a level above the low. Primary school teaching in the Greek world, stated Marrou, was "a humble, somewhat despised occupation . . . a trade, in the servile, commercial sense, because it meant running after customers and asking for money . . . [it] was a paid job, and what was worse, it was badly paid. . . . But the fundamental reason for the contempt in which the teaching profession was held was that it required no special qualifications."[12] On the other hand, it is easy to point to the "exalted and honorable" position occupied by such scholar-teachers as Socrates, Plato, Aristotle, Speusippus, and Isocrates. The account of the crisis-conflict and power struggle in relation to the teachings of Socrates is too well known to require repetition. As a rule, there was a positive correlation between the prestige of the teacher and the educational level of his work. The Sophists may have been criticized and subjected to

---

[11]Howard S. Galt, *The Development of Chinese Educational Theory: The Historical Development of the Theory of Education in China to the Close of the Han Dynasty, A.D. 220* (Shanghai: Commercial Press, 1929), 163.

[12]H. I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity* (New York: New American Library, 1964), 203-04. The translator, George Lamb, rendered the term *métier d'instituteur* as "teaching profession." This is in the nature of an anachronistic overstatement. For the original see Henri-Irénée Marrou, *Histoire de l'education dans l'antiquité* (Paris: Editions du Seuil, 1948),205.

prejudice because of their "free thinking"[13] and their fees, but they were surely not despised, since they were educated men.

The Roman slave-teacher was hardly on a higher rung of the social ladder than the paidagogos. Drawing upon Lucius Annaeus Florus, Pliny the Younger's *Epistles,* Horace's Juvenal's *Satires,* and Ovid's *Fasti,* Marrou concluded that, "in Rome, as in Greece, schoolmastering remained a despised occupation, the lowest of all professions [*le dernier des metiers*], *rem indignissiman* [Florus]--tiring, arduous and badly paid. . . School-teaching brought no prestige to anyone; it was all right for slaves, freemen and nonentities. . . ."[14] One recalls Martial's denunciation of the "accursed pedagogue" ("ludi scelerate magister"), the "blatant fellow" ("garule"), whom he hoped to silence by paying him to hold his tongue as much as for "bawling"[15] In the aristocratic societies of Greece and Rome, such teachers, whose moral status frequently was under suspicion, did not earn any more respect than they did money. The slaves, subject peoples, and soldiers may have revolted at various times against the Roman power, but the primary-school pedagogues remained placid. At any rate, no sources have been located that reveal any conflicts or crises involving the low men in the Roman educational scheme.

The *grammaticus,* or secondary school teacher in Rome, enjoyed more prestige and pay than the primary teacher. However, they were still "badly paid," perhaps because many of them ". . .had been slaves, often they were outcasts --foundlings, ruined men, or failures," according to the testimony of Suet Suetonius' *Of Grammarians* and Pliny the Elder's *Natural History.*[16]

---

[13]Kenneth J. Freeman, *Schools of Hellas,* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1969) p. 178.

[14]Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity, op. cit.,* p. 361; *Historie de l'education dans l'antiquite, op. cit.,* p. 362.

[15]Walter C. A. Kerr, ed., *Martial: Epigrams,* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard Harvard University Press, 1968) Vol. II, Book IX: 68, p. 124.

[16]Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity, op. cit.,* p. 370.

If, as many seem to believe, a teacher's status is measurable in monetary terms, they would find some support in the Roman practice in remunerating the teachers. Special financial benefits date from Julius Caesar and Augustus, who tried to attract Greeks to teach in Rome. From the time of Vespasian onward, all teachers in secondary schools and higher institutions were granted tax exemptions and other privileges, a practice which found its way into the Code of Justinian in the sixth century. Thus Hadrian honored and enriched all teachers (*omnes professores honoravit et divites fecit)* according to his biographer.[17] Even primary school teachers and others who dealt with children were the beneficiaries, at some time, of the imperial immunities.[18] With a constantly increasing number of persons being added to the favored list, the roster of taxpayers was reduced, resulted in ". . . the obvious ill-will of the municipal authorities, who objected to all these exemptions because, in bringing relief to some of their citizens, they [the emperors] laid heavier burdens on the rest."[19] When, furthermore, leading figures rushed into the act by obtaining recognition as teachers, "often merely honorary ones,"[20] so as to save on taxes, the central government began to backtrack. The pendulum swung away from the extreme along the lines made familiar by Hegel.

Much attention was accorded in Rome to the advanced teachers, such as Plutarch the Greek and Quintilian the Spaniard. The latter was the recipient of the imperial professorship established by Vespasian which served as precedent for the subventions to professors by Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius. The power of the emperors was enough, in most cases, to ensure the position and prestige of the higher teachers. We can assume, however, that there were dissatisfied persons in and out of the educational field who did not obtain the

---

[17]Aelius Spartianus,"Vita Hadriani," as quoted in Paul Barth, *Die Geschichte der Erziehung in soziologischer und geistesgeschichtlicher Beleuchtung* (Leipzig: Reisland, 1925), Sixth Edition, p. 144, n. 3.

[18]*Ibid.*, 403-04.

[19]*Ibid.*, 404.

[20]*Ibid.*

perquisites they were convinced they deserved. The sub rosa conflicts, however, cannot be conveniently documented. The power was exercised, the conflict was repressed or suppressed, and a crisis did not usually develop in this aspect of the educational experience of the Roman imperium.

Before leaving Rome, we should make mention of a critical situation involving rhetors, advanced teachers. Tacitus, citing Cicero, called attention to the conflict between those who called themselves "rhetors" and public opinion in 92 B.C, during the administration of the censors Crassus and Domitius. The abuses by the rhetors of one *Schola impudentiae* were so blatant that public disfavor mounted with a force strong enough to bring about its closing.[21] Thus, the power of the people manifested itself to put an end to the indoctrination by the roguish rhetoricians of ignorance, impudence, and irrelevance in young men.

Passing mention was made of the status of the teacher in the non-European, specifically the Asiatic, areas of the world. It may be appropriate, at this point, to include some data regarding some of these societies. In ancient India, since Vedic times (*c.* 1500 B.C.), the teacher was looked upon by society as "the spiritual and intellectual father of the student,"[22] and was to be revered by him even more than his parents. This parallels the statements in the Talmud that "he who teaches the Torah to the son of his friend is as though he were his parent"[23] and, in some circumstances, the student is required to honor the teacher more than his father.[24] The status of the teacher, accordingly, was exalted when he was a scholar, but sometimes less honored if he taught very young children and was himself a man of modest learning. Yet, the *Ethics of the*

---

[21]Tacitus, "Dialogus de Oratoribus," Section 35, in Henri Goelzer *et al.*, eds., *Tacite* (Paris: Les Belles Lettres, 1922), Latin text, 64; W. Hamilton Fyfe, ed., *Tacitus* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1908), English translation, 37.

[22]A. S. Altekar, *Education in Ancient India* (Varanasi: Nand Kishore, 1965), 50.

[23]Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Sanhedrin, 19b.

[24]Babylonian Talmud, Tractate Baba Mezia, 33a. This was codified by Maimonides in the twelfth century. Rabbenu Moshe ben Maimon, *Mishnah Torah, hu Yad Ha-Hazakah* (Jerusalem: El Ha-Mekorot, 1954), 44.

Fathers states that a person who learns "even a single letter" must honor his teacher.[25] In general, the historical evidence points most often to scholarship as the basis of the teacher's prestige. According to Goitein, the letters of Jewish teachers in the Moslem countries during the Middle Ages reveal that even those of less than the higher level were well-educated and proficient in Arabic and Hebrew.[26] Even if respect was not always translated into adequate reward, the basic principle throughout the ages was to have ". . . reverence for your teacher as for God."[27]

The importance of the learned teacher in Islamic society is known to students of educational history. In an early thirteenth century treatise on education, the author insists that one must "glorify and venerate the teacher. . . . verily, he who teaches you one letter of those you need for your religious instruction is your father in religion."[28] This honor is translatable into drachmae and transferable to the master's dear ones: "Revering the teacher includes respecting the teacher's children and those who belong to him."[29] This exemplary and elevated attitude to the teacher, alas, was not maintained uniformly, in this or in other societies. At times, even in the medieval era, elementary teachers' prestige did not rise as high and some, indeed, were regarded with contempt.[30] As a general principle, knowledge and character were

---

[25]"Pirke Abot," *Ethics of the Fathers*, Chapter VI, paragraph 3.

[26]Shlomo D. Goitein, *Sidrei Hinuch b'yemei ha-Geonim u-beit ha-Rambam: Mekorot hadashim min ha-Genizah* (Jerusalem: Ben-Zvi Institute, Hebrew University, 1962), 117-20.

[27]"Pirke Abot," Chapter IV, paragraph 15.

[28]Az-Zarnūjī, *Ta'līm al-Muta'allim-Tarīq at-Ta'allum, Instruction of the Student: The Method of Learning*, translated by G. E. Von Grunebaum and Theodora M. Abel (New York: King's Crown Press, 1947), 32.

[29]*Ibid.*, 33.

[30]Bayard Dodge, *Muslim Education in Medieval Times* (Washington: Middle East Institute, 1962), 4; A. S. Tritton, *Materials on Muslim Education in the Middle Ages* (London: Luzac, 1957), 8; and Mehdi Nakosteen, *History of Islamic Origins of Western Education: A.D. 800-1350* (Boulder: University of Colorado Press, 1964), 56-57.

the criteria of a successful reputation as a teacher. Those whose contacts with children did not reflect these qualities were considered failures and were treated accordingly.

The intellectual position of the pedagogues was paramount during the European Middle Ages from Peter Abelard onwards, and especially since the rise of universities. The drawing power of the professors at the University of Paris during the thirteenth century was evidenced by the numbers of students who came to sit at the feet of such scholars as Thomas Aquinas, Albertus Magnus, John Duns Scotus, Roger Bacon, and Ramon Lull.[31] In due time, the hardier of the students survived to earn the degrees of *Magister* and *Doctor* and the license of *Ius ubique docendi*. These products of "an international institution for the preparation of teachers"[32] organized and staffed other universities in Europe. And to retain their power within the higher educational enterprise, the professors and students organized a guild or union, the *Universitas Magistrorum et Scholarium*. Another instance of the exercise of power was the unwillingness of the University of Paris to recognize the degrees granted by Oxford without additional examination, a compliment returned by the latter. As universities increasingly began to distrust the degrees of sister institutions and insisted on a license examination before admitting holders of degrees to teaching posts, the value of the *Ius ubique docendi* was reduced from the ecumenical to the honorary.[33] The locus of power was now in the hands of teachers in each

---

[31]Maurice de Wulf, *Philosophy and Civilization in the Middle Ages* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1922), 73.

[32]William W. Brickman, "Historical Perspectives on the International Component in Teacher Education." Paper presented to the First World Congress of Comparative Education Societies, University of Ottawa, August 17, 1970, 3, 4-5 (mimeographed), *Cf.*, Brubacher, *op. cit.*, 468-70.

[33]Hastings Rashdall, *The Universities of Europe in the Middle Ages*, (London: Oxford University Press, 1936), new edition, I, 13-15.

university, and the *Universitas* became the designation for the entire institution.[34]

That the higher teachers of the Middle Ages, for all their exalted status, were not immune from criticism is evident from the complaint in the fourteenth century by Alvarus Pelagius (d. 1352), grand penitentiary at Avignon. This churchman castigated the masters as "unlearned and insufficiently prepared . . . [who] admit inept and ignorant persons to be masters. Second, moved by envy, they scorn to admit well-prepared subordinates to professional chairs, and full of arrogance, they despise others and censure their utterances unreasonably. . . ."[35] Appointed to his post by Pope John XXII, Alvarus went on to accuse the masters of teaching false theological doctrines, of being "dumb dogs unable to bark," of not reproving undisciplined and immoral students, of teaching "what is subtle, not what is useful," and of other shortcomings. His denunciation knew no geographical bounds, and he directed his displeasure at ". . . the masters of Paris and those of England at Oxford, secular as well as regular, Dominicans as well as Franciscans, and others of whom the arrogance of some is inexplicable."[36] Such sharp criticisms could have had considerable force, keeping in mind the position of Alvarus, but it is very likely that its collective character and unrestrained rhetoric limited its possible impact. The conflict between the outside critic and the academic constituency apparently

---

[34]Other terms were also used for the university throughout its history: *Academia, Studium Generale, Archigymnasium.* In the light of the future pejorative connotation of *pedagogy*, it is interesting to note that the University of Glasgow, early in the sixteenth century, was identified by the equivalent terms of *pedagogy* and *university (Pedagogium seu Universitas).* See Rashdall, *op. cit.*, II, 317.

[35]Alvarus Pelagius (Alvaro Paes), "De planctu ecclesiae," in Antonino of Florence, *Summa Theologiae*, II, 5, 2, 10, as translated in Lynn Thorndike, *University Records and Life in the Middle Ages* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1944), 171. Antonino was Archbishop of Florence, 1446-1459.

[36]*Ibid.*, 172.

did not reach the crisis state. The writing of Alvarus may have fallen into oblivion during the succeeding centuries, and his non-readers may have been multitudinous, but his fulminations have appeared countless times in printed and oral form as late as the present century. Many who never knew Alvarus echoed and re-echoed his criticisms, making no motion to substantiate their sentiments by mere facts and to particularize their generalizations. There has been an unconscious transfer of training, from one century to the next, in improved and frequently irresponsible denunciations of teacher training and other aspects of education.

The advent of humanism brought with it an emphasis on teaching and teachers. The importance of the Byzantine instructors of Greek in fifteenth-century Italy and of Italian teachers in England and elsewhere in Europe has been recognized since the Renaissance era.[37] International and national reputations were won in the fifteenth and sixteenth centuries by such outstanding teachers as Vittorino da Feltre, Guarino da Verona, Erasmus of Rotterdam, Johann Reuchlin, Philipp Melanchthon, Johannes Sturm. Tracts on education by some of these pedagogues and others[38] began to appear with some frequency, and these probably aided in the preparation of teachers and in the guidance of those in service. Pedagogy was in the air and sometimes on the ground. In 1438 or 1439, William Byngham, parson of St. John Zachary's in London, petitioned King Henry VI for permission to open in Cambridge a college for the preparation of secondary school teachers ". . . bicause that ther is so grete scarstee of maistres of

---

[37]See, for example: Georg Voigt, *Die Wiederbelebung des classischen Alterthums oder das erste Jahrhundert des Humanismus*, (Berlin: Reimer, 1880-1881), second edition 2 vols.; Deno J. Geanokoplos, *Greek Scholars in Venice: Studies in the Dissemination of Greek Learning from Byzantium to Western Europe* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1962); and R. Weiss, *Humanism in England in the Fifteenth Century* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1957), second edition.

[38]See William H. Woodward, *Vittorino da Feltre and Other Humanist Educators* (Cambridge: University Press, 1897); *Desiderius Erasmus Concerning the Aim and Method of Education* (Cambridge: University Press, 1904); and *Studies in Education During the Age of the Renaissance, 1400-1600* (Cambridge: University Press, 1906).

Gramer. . . ."[39] The Goddishous or Goddeshous, as Byngham called his school, was to supply what Cambridge University lacked, namely the teaching of grammar, which he considered the basis of all knowledge. Specifically, he requested authorization for 23 students ". . . for to comense in gramer, and a Preest to gouerne them, for reformacion of the said defaute, for the loue of God, and in the wey of Charytee."[40] As Armytage points out, ". . . the curriculum in Godshouse did not include what we should now call 'method' lectures, for the simple reason that in the normal preparation for a degree each student was supposed to give, as well as to listen to, a certain number of lectures."[41] This type of student teaching experience served as the professional supplement to the subject matter learned by the prospective teachers.

There is little doubt that not all teachers deserved or enjoyed the respect accorded the great humanistic teachers. It is more than likely that complaints and criticisms were made of bad instruction and ignorant teachers. Sir Thomas Elyot lamented in 1531 the dearth of "perfecte schole maisters" and at the same time the damage to ". . . many good and clene wittes of children . . . by ignorant schole maisters."[42] As he saw the situation, there were "many well lerned" men who could have been attracted to teaching ". . . if the name of a schole maister were not so moche had in contempte, and also if theyr labours with abundant salaries mought be requited. . . ."[43] The trouble was that a lazy B.A. or M.A. with but "a spone full of latine" will offer to teach grammar

---

[39]Document in Arthur F. Leach, *Educational Charts and Documents, 598-1909* (Cambridge: University Press, 1911), 402. A portion of this petition with slightly different spelling appears in W. H. G. Armytage, "William Byngham: A Medieval Protagonist of the Training of Teachers," *History of Education Journal*, II, Summer 1951, 108.

[40]Document in Leach, *op. cit.*, 403.

[41]Armytage, *op. cit.*, 109.

[42]Sir Thomas Elyot, *The Boke Named the Governour* (London: Dent, n.d. Book I, Chapter XV, 69.

[43]*Ibid.*, 70.

and literature: ". . . he wyll, for a small salarie, sette a false colour of lernyng on propre wittes, whiche wyll be wasshed away with one shoure of raine."[44] The answer of the century to this sore problem was given half a century later in Richard Mulcaster's *Positions* (1581). In this classic, the headmaster of Merchant Taylors' and St. Paul's Schools urged vigorously that teachers' training colleges be established at the universities so that teachers could be prepared on the same basis as physicians, lawyers, and clergymen. It is interesting to follow Mulcaster's train of thought about teachers.

First, let us cite the complete title: *Positions Wherin Those Primitive circumstances Be Examined, Which Are Necessarie for the Training vp of Children, Either for Skill in Their Booke, or Health in Their Bodie."* After the Epistle Dedicatorie "to the Most Vertuous Ladie," Queen Elizabeth, Mulcaster discussed in detail the aims, curriculum, and methods of educating children, eminently exemplifying the exhortations of Juvenal: "Orandum est ut sit mens sana in corpore sano." In line with this objective, recommended, for example, the art of "wrastling" as an exercise. "It is a freind to the head, bettereth the bulke, and strengtheneth the sinewes."[46] It was quite logical for him to assign "both the framing of the minde, and the training of the bodie to one mans charge . . . ."[47] A teacher, argued Mulcaster, should be recompensed properly so that he should not have to resort to moonlighting to supplement an impecunious income: "For what reason is it to have a mans whole labour, and to allow him liuing stant [scant?] sufficient for a quarter? or what pollicie is it, to haue him that should teache well, to be enforced for neede, to meddle with some trade, quite different from the schoole?"[48] The sixteenth-century educator thus

---

[44] *Ibid.*

[45] London: Thomas Vautrollier, 1581.

[46] Richard Mulcaster, *Positions*, edited by Robert H. Quick (London: Longmans, Green, 1888), Chapter 17, 77.

[47] *Ibid.*, Chapter 35, 124.

[48] *Ibid.*, Chapter 40, 228.

hit hard a very serious handicap to teaching incentive and efficiency. No doubt he was well aware of the fact that the status of the teacher as teacher is seldom enhanced in the public mind when it becomes common knowledge that a teacher earns extra cash as a bartender or some similar occupation.

What is even more significant was Mulcaster's insistence that the elementary school teacher should receive highest salary:

"For the *Elementarie* bycause good scholers will not abse themselues to it, it is left to the meanest, and therfore to the worst. For that the first grounding would be handled by the best, and his reward would be greatest, bycause both his paines and his iudgement should be with the greatest. And it would easily allure sufficient men to come downe so lowe, if they might preceaue that reward would rise vp. No man of iudgement will contrarie this pointe, neither can any ignorant be blamed for the contrarie: the one seeth the thing to be but low in order, the other knoweth the ground to be great in laying, not onely for the matter which the child doth learne: which is very small in shew, though great for proces: but also for the manner of handling his witte, to harten him for afterward, which is of great moment."[49] Good pay, presumably, would attract to the teaching profession persons who were other than "the meanest" and the "worst." In this way the image of the elementary school teacher would become elevated. Possibly, too, Mulcaster was grinding his own axe by trying to insure a corps of teachers of quality in the primary schools, so that the grammar schools (*e.g.*, Merchant Taylor's, etc.) would have better prepared students.

A major proposal by Mulcaster was that of ". . . a seminarie for excellent maisters . . . within the vniversitie . . . ."[50] He coupled teaching with other professions under the aegis of higher education: "whereby not onely

---

[49] *Ibid.*, Chapter 41, 233.

[50] *Ibid.*, 236.

schoolemaisters, but all other professours also shalbe made excellently able to perfo me that in the common weale which she looketh for at their handes, when they come from the vniuersitie."[51] Mulcaster's program for university reform envisaged an institution of seven colleges: languages, mathematics, philosophy, divinity, law, *physicke* (medicine), and "the seventh colledge for training maisters." Concerning the last-named, the English pedagogue conceded that "some difficultie there will be to winne a colledge for such as shall afterward passe to teache schooles."[52] With this remark, Mulcaster anticipated the argumentation, conflicts, power struggles, and conflicts with regard to the teaching of Pedagogy or Education in higher educational institutions, particularly in the United States.

Finally, it is only right in concluding this discussion to quote Mulcaster's closing effort to upgrade, by the power of the printed word, the status of the teacher, by providing him with higher education, a professional preparation within the university, and prestige enjoyed by other professions. "And why should not these men haue both this sufficiencie in learning, and such roome to rest in, thence to be chosen and set forth for the common seruice? be either children, or schooles so small a portion of our multitude? or is the framing of young mindes, and the training of their bodies so meane a point of cunning? be schoolemaisters in this Realme such a paucitie, as they are not euen in good sadness to be soundly thought on? If the chancell haue a minister, the belfray hath a maister: and where youth is, as it is eachwhere, there must be trainers, or there will be worse. He that will not allow of this carefull prouision for such a seminarie of maisters, is most vnworthy either to haue had a good one for his. Why should not teachers be well prouided for, to continue their whole in the schoole, as *Diuines, Lawyers, Physicians* do in

---

[51] *Ibid.*, 237.

[52] *Ibid.*, 248.

their seuerall professions? Thereby iudgement, cunning, and discretion will grow in them: and maisters would proue olde men, and such as *Xenophon* setteth ouer children in the schooling of *Cyrus*. Wheras now, the schoole being vsed but for a shift, afterward to passe thence to the other professions, though it send out very sufficient men to them, it selfe remaineth too naked, considering the necessitie of the thing. I conclude therfore that this trade requireth a particular college, for these foure causes. 1. First for the subject being the neane to make or mar the whole frye of our state. 2. Secondary for the number, whether of them that are to learne, or of them that are to teache. 3. Thirdly for the necessitie of the profession which maye not be spared. 4. Fourthly for the matter of their studie which is comparable to the great professions, for language, for iudgement, for skil how to traine, for varietie in all pointes of learning, wherin the framing of the minde, and the exercising of the bodie craueth exquisite consideration, beside the staidnes of the person."[53]

The failure of Mulcaster to influence the course of teacher education was doubtless due to a variety of causes, among them basic opposition to an idea which evidently was considerably ahead of its time. An occasional echo seemed to resound after Mulcaster's death. Thus in 1622 John Brinsley deplored "the endlesse vexation of the painfull Maisters, the extreme labour and terrour of the poore scholars, with enduring far ouermuch and long seueritie." He attributed this state of affairs to the fact that ". . . so few of those who vndertake this function are acquainted with anie good method, or right order of instruction, fit for a Grammer schoole."[54] Not only Mulcaster's thought, but also his very existence faded from memory. Apart from Quick[55] and Barnard,[56]

---

[53] *Ibid.*, 248-49.

[54] Quoted in Robert H. Quick, *Essays on Educational Reformers* (New York: Appleton, 1890).

[55] John Brinsley, *A Consolation for Our Grammar Schooles* (1622), Thomas C. Pollock, ed. (New York: Scholars' Facsimiles and Reprints, 1943), 2.

[56] Henry Barnard, *English Pedagogy* (Hartford: Brown and Gross, 1876), second series.

few educational historians, English and otherwise, treat him more than cursorily, while most writers ignore him.[57] To some extent, at least, the reason for the oblivion may be traced to ". . . affectation in Mulcaster's style which is very irritating. . . [and which proved to be] the death-warrant of his literary renown."[58] To this must be added the fact that the contemporary reader may find it rough going to follow sixteenth-century English prose since the one available version, abridged, is out of print and generally hard to get.[59]

Turning to the European continent, we find that the elementary teacher in fifteenth century Germany often had to expand his income by assisting at wedding and funerals, while under a tight discipline with regard to his personal behavior and habits. The respect accorded the elementary teacher and his assistants was very much below that shown to such higher functionaries as the principal of a grammar school.[60] During the following century, even teachers of more advanced students could not boast of more than "negligible disease."[61] One effort to maintain some sort of standard and to discourage competition by unlicensed individuals, the teachers of Munich formed a guild in 1595, and this

---

[57]Among the exceptions are: E. B. Castle, *The Teacher* (London: Oxford University Press, 1970), 89-93; Luella Cole, *A History of Education: Socrates to Montessori* (New York: Rinehart, 1950)265-75. Two monographs may be mentioned: H. A. Klähr, *Leben und Werke Richard Mulcaster, eines englischen Pädagogen des sechzehnten Jahrhunderts* (Leipzig: Bleyl and Kammerer, 1893), Ph.D. dissertation, University of Leipzig; and Cornelie Benndorf, "Die englische Pädagogik im 16. Jahrhundert: Elyot, Ascham, und Mulcaster," *Wiener Beiträge zur englischen Philologie* (University of Vienna, 1905), XXII.

[58]Quick, *op. cit.*,91-92. According to Adolphe E. Meyer, *An Educational History of the Western World* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1965), Mulcaster wrote "in a drab and graceless English," 226.

[59]James Oliphant, ed., *The Educational Writings of Richard Mulcaster (1532-1611)* , (Glasgow: Maclehose, 1903).

[60]Emil Reicke, *Lehrer und Unterrichtswesen in der deutschen Vergangenheit* (Leipzig: Diederichs, 1901), 64-66.

[61]*Ibid.*, 101.

became the prototype for similar organizations in Frankfurt, Nurnberg, Augsburg, and Lübeck. These guilds insisted upon some type of teacher training, even if inadequate, but they contributed nothing substantial toward solving the problem of teacher preparation. In operating as a trade guild, ". . . they not only protected themselves against competitors but served to perpetuate narrowing traditions and to exclude new ideas."[62]

The idea of a teachers' training school in Germany apparently originated in the mind of Duke Ernst the Pious of Gotha in the mid-seventeenth century as a means of upgrading education and thereby improving the government of his state. The Siminarium praeceptorum (1696) established by August Hermann Francke in Halle, the Seminaria scholastica (1698) of Duke Friedrich II Gotha, and other schools constituted steps in the development of teacher training which culminated in the founding of a private normal school in 1748 in Berlin by Johann Julius Hecker.[63] As Prussia grew in power as a state, so did its organized school system and the institutions for the training of teachers. Also during the eighteenth century, teacher training and the study of Padagogik entered the Universities of Jena, Göttingen, and Halle, and subsequently in the other German universities. This was accomplished over opposition, some of it by church groups displeased by the competition.[64]

Among the other opponents to Pedagogy in the late nineteenth century were professors, for example, Ulrich von Wilamowitz-Möllendorff, eminent professor of classics at Göttingen and Berlin, who rejected the idea of preparing Gymnasium teachers in universities, and Georg Anton Hugo von Below, professor of history at Marburg, Freiburg im Breisgau, and elsewhere. Their arguments were countered by the outstanding historiographer, Ernst Bernheim.[65] Contributing

---

[62] I. L. Kandel, *The Training of Elementary School Teachers in Germany* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1910), 3.

[63] *Ibid.*, 6-8.

[64] Wilhelm Fries, *Die wissenschaftliche und praktische Vorbildung für das höhere Lehramt* (Munich: Beck, 1910), second edition, 36-37.

[65] *Ibid.*, 21, 21 note.

to the universal acceptance of Pädagogik in the German universities, and by their leadership all over Europe and the United States, were the excellent examples of professors who taught courses in Education, such as Immanuel Kant, Johann Friedrich Herbart, Christian Gottlob Heyne, Friedrich August Wolf, Wilhelm Rein, Wilhelm Dilthey, Tuiskon Ziller, Theobald Ziegler, and Wilhelm Paulsen. These men were scholars of recognition in some academic discipline and in Education. It is very likely that it was this combination of competencies that reduced the controversy concerning the status of Pädagogik. Their publications, both in the disciplines and in Education, commanded the respect of their colleagues. The development of a scholarly literature in the history of education and in educational psychology was another probable factor in gaining recognition for Padagogik as a university discipline. It is pertinent to recall, as examples, the "Monumenta Germaniae Paedagogica," the *Zeitschrift für Geschichte der Erziehung und des Unterrichts*, and the *Monatshefte der Comenius-Gesellschaft*. Also useful to the academic community, as well as to others, were the multivolume educational encyclopedias of K. A. Schmid and Wilhelm Rein and the carefully edited collections of the pedagogical classics.

Given more time and space, it would be desirable to explore the development of teacher training in theory and in practice throughout Europe and the United States. Since this is not feasible in a brief essay, all that can be done at this point is to mention some details of the past three centuries which may have a bearing on the recent and current controversies regarding teacher education in the United States and elsewhere.

It is not easy to estimate the effect of the extreme attitude of Jan Amos Comenius, one of the most brilliant pedagogues of all time, to Pedagogy -- "puerilia illa mihi toties nauseata."[66] Clearly, this did not discourage

---

[66] Quoted in M. W. Keatinge, "Introduction: I, Biographical," in M. W. Keatinge, ed., *The Great Didactic of John Amos Comenius* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1896), 97.

others from the theory and practice of this field. On the other hand, it may have influenced some to look down on this area of learning now that one of its foremost exponents expressed his disdain. Be that as it may, teacher got off to a firm start in France with the Brothers of the Christian Schools founded by St. Jean-Baptiste de la Salle. The pattern of the normal school, developed in Prussia, spread to the other parts of Germany, Austria, the Low Countries, and the United States. With the rise of the Bell-Lancaster monitorial system of instruction, teacher training of a most elementary sort took root. In due time, rational minds in England and elsewhere realized that since it was necessary to prepare teachers for their duties, stronger programs of training should be organized.[67] Similarly, as experience indicated that weaknesses existed in teacher training, campaigns were initiated to bring about reform. This might be a relatively safe generalization to characterize the changes during the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in Europe.[68] One might venture to forecast that some changes would continue to occur and controversies would be resolved by compromise.

Let us glance briefly at the American experience with teacher educa-

---

[67]Gustaf Ogren, *Trends in English Teachers' Training from 1800* (Stockholm: Esselte Aktiebolag, 1953), 40-41.

[68]The literature on the history of teacher training and the teaching profession in European countries includes: Asher Tropp, *The School Teachers: The Growth of the Teaching Profession in England and Wales from 1800 to the Present Day* (New York: Macmillan, 1957); Ake W. Edfeldt, *Lärarutbildning* (Stockholm: Liber, 1961); Georges Duveau, *Les instituteurs* (Paris: Editions du Deuil, 1957); Helge Dahl, *Norsk Laererutdanning fra 1814 til i dag* (Oslo: Universitetsforlaget, 1959); E. Jacqueline Guyatt, comp.,"The Training of Lay Primary Teachers in France from the Beginning of the Seventeenth Century to 1815,"*Educational Libraries Bulletin* (University of London Institute of Education), Supplement No. 3, Autumn, 1960; and James M. Clark, *Teachers and Politics in France: A Pressure Group Study of the Fédération de l'Education Nationale* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1967).

tion.[69] The image of the elementary teacher of colonial times was not always inspiring if one thinks of the dame of the dame school and of the frequently inebriated and incarcerated Adam Roelantsen of Nieuw Amsterdam. Before one concludes, however, that the teaching profession got off to a sad start, let him recall the incomparable Ezekiel Cheever of New England and the pious schoolmaster on the Skippack, Christoph Dock. The growing awareness in the New Republic of the need for a new breed of teacher, one with special training, was strengthened by the conviction of the inadequacy of the Lancasterian practice of teacher preparation. The exemplary efficiency of German education, attributed to the normal schools by Horace Mann and other pedagogical peregrinators, plus the propaganda by the Rev. Charles Brooks ("as is the teacher, so is the school"), were significant factors underlying the genesis and rapid growth of the normal school movement in the United States throughout the nineteenth century. The controversy between Horace Mann and the Boston schoolmasters over teacher training on the Prussian plan has been frequently narrated in historical works on American education. The resolution of this battle of bulletins was in favor of Mann, who possessed the prestige and power of the government in addition to persuasiveness with the public and the profession at large.

It is not possible in this compressed account to analyze the various

---

[69] Among the works on the history of teacher education in the United States are: John P. Gordy, "Rise and Growth of the Normal School Idea in the United States," U.S. Bureau of Education, Circular of Information No. 8, 1891 (Washington: U.S. Government Printing Office, 1891); Vernon Mangun, *The American Normal: Its Rise and Development in Massachusetts* (Baltimore: Warwick and York, 1928); Jessie M. Pangburn, *The Evolution of the American Teachers College* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1932); [Benjamin W. Frazier], "History of the Professional Education of Teachers in the United States," in *National Survey of the Education of Teachers*, Vol. V, Bulletin 1933, No. 9, U.S. Office of Education, Washington, D.C., 1935, 1-86; Willard S. Elsbree, *The American Teacher: Evolution of a Profession in a Democracy* (New York: American Book Co., 1939); Walter S. Monroe, *Teacher/Learning Theory and Teacher Education, 1890-1952* (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1952); and Merle L. Borrowman, *The Liberal and the Technical in Teacher Educati A Historical Survey of American Thought* (New York: Bureau of Publications, Teachers College, Columbia University, 1956).

controversies of the nineteenth and twentieth centuries in teacher education. The literature has been vast and is growing vaster by the year. We might mention a sampling of the issues which divided the opinions and judgments of individuals within and without the field. One serious controversy erupted in the early 1960's over the nature and evaluative standards of the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE).[70] The critical analyses of teacher education by Conant[71] and Koerner,[72] while making some good points, aroused considerable discussion and debate, including some opposition, in part because of allegations of faulty research and biased or sweeping generalizations.[73] The name of Conant, his sponsorship by the Carnegie Corporation of New York, and his frequent appearances before educational audiences added weight to his critical analysis and recommendations. The caustic Koerner hit harder at teacher education and exhibited more bias and less solid knowledge: At any rate, many educators seemed to feel that Conant was a friendly critic while Koerner was a remote echo of Arthur E. Bestor in the early 1950's.

In passing, let there be no implication that power could be exerted only by critics of teacher education. In 1953 there was an organized campaign by teacher educators to punish the writer for having published Bestor's negative

---

[70]John R. Mayor and Willis G. Swartz, *Accreditation in Teacher Education: Its Influence on Higher Education* (Washington: National Commission on Accrediting, 1965), 65-84.

[71]James B. Conant, *The Education of American Teachers* (New York: McGraw-Hill, 1963).

[72]James D. Koerner, *The Miseducation of American Teachers* (Boston: Houghton Mifflin, 1963).

[73]"A Symposium on James B. Conant's *The Education of American Teachers*," *Journal of Teacher Education*, XV, March, 1964, 1-45; *Phi Delta Kappan*, XLV, June, 1964, 425-43; William W. Brickman, "Conant, Koerner, and the History of Education," *School and Society*, Vol. 92, March 21, 1964, 135-39; and Robert M. Weiss, ed., *The Conant Controversy in Teacher Education* (New York: Random House, 1969).

appraisal of teacher education and certification in the United States.[74] The power moves, which were directed at the editor rather than the writer, included efforts to have the former discharged from his editorial and professorial posts. These attempts were countered by statements of defense by deans of schools of education and academicians, as well as by a support on the part of Dean Ernest O. Melby on academic and publishing freedom.

The issue of the recognition of *education* as a university subject, and possibly as an academic discipline also deserves some analysis. The idea of the academic study of education, already well under way in Germany, was apparently first proposed by the Amherst College faculty in a report on August 21, 1826. The establishment of "a department for the thorough education of teachers," in the opinion of the faculty "lies at the very foundation of all improvement."[75] In the report of December, 1826, the faculty, in reiterating its call for a new department "for systematic instruction in the science of education," emphasized that "no respectable College would think itself organized, without a department of Natural Philosophy and another of Chemistry -- not without Professors in Rhetoric and the Languages; and yet how few who enjoy these advantages in College expect ever to be practical Chemists, or Philosophers, or Critics. How then can the most distinguished and useful literary institutions in the land, go on from year to year witout a single instructor devoted to the science of education, when three-fourths of their sons expect to be teachers, in one form or another themselves, and when the primary schools, academies and higher

---

[74]Arthur E. Bestor, Jr., "On the Education and Certification of Teachers," *School and Society*, Vol. 78, September 19, 1953, 81-87. See: William W. Brickman, "Education, Pedagogy, and Dr. Bestor," *School and Society*, Vol. 78, November 14, 1953, 153-154; Arthur Bestor, *The Restoration of Learning* (New York: Knopf, 1955), 92-194; and the correspondence in *School and Society* in 1954.

[75]Quoted in Louis F. Snow, *The College Curriculum in the United States* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1907), 156.

institutions of learning, require twice or thrice as many thousands to supply them, as are wanted for all the learned professions together?"[76] Nothing came of this recommendation, but it should be noted that the initiative for a department of education came from academic professors. The subject of Pedagogy or Education was authorized and taught during the nineteenth century at the University of the City of New York (now New York University), Antioch College, Brown University, the State University of Iowa, the University of Michigan, Columbia University, Yale University, Harvard University, and in other institutions.

The development during the early decades of centers of teacher education, as at Teachers College (Columbia University), the University of Chicago, Stanford University, and the George Peabody College for Teachers, was exemplary for the country as a whole. Teachers College, moreoever, became the center for the training of teachers, supervisors, administrators, and scholars in education on a worldwide level.[77] It may have been widely believed that this unique institution was separated from the rest of Columbia by West 120th Street, "the widest street in the world," but facts turned out to be firmer than fiction. There were scholars on both sides of the street, students as well as professors, as there were time-servers, clock-watchers, and mini-minds. There has never been an objective, qualitative, comparative investigation of Education and non-Education faculties over the decades at Teachers College, but this lack has never discouraged some persons from holding fast to what they regarded as rational, if not indeed scientific, judgments about the institution "across the

---

[76]Quoted in *Ibid.*, 159. Both documents were subsequently published as: *The Substance of Two Reports of the Faculty of Amherst College to the Board of Trustees, with the Doings of the Board Thereon*, by the Committee of the Trustees, Amherst College (Amherst: Carter and Adams, 1827). This publication was not available to the writer.

[77]Lawrence A. Cremin, David A. Shannon, and Mary E. Townsend, *A History of Teachers College, Columbia University* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1954).

street." No doubt, many professors and administrators at Columbia took as the final word the criticisms, some of them devastatingly accurate, by Abraham Flexner,[78] the exponent of excellence in medical education.

At Harvard, the introduction of Education in 1891 as an academic course within the Department of Philosophy was facilitated by the power of President Charles William Eliot, as well as by the support of George Herbert Palmer, Josiah Royce, and William James despite some skepticism on the part of various faculty members.[79] The experience of Yale with Education proved less felicitous, from the standpoint of the educationists. After sixty years of preparing educational experts and scholars, President A. Whitney Griswold, a specialist in history and author of books in Education, inaugurated a Master of Arts in Teaching program under the direction of an academic professor and with a three-year grant by the Carnegie Corporation. Fortified in 1954 by a substantial subvention from the Fund for the Advancement of Education, ". . . the University decided to throw its entire weight behind the M.A.T. program. Registrations in the Department of Education itself were to cease and retiring staff members were not to be replaced. Since activities were restricted merely to fulfilling obligations already incurred, the Department, under these circumstances, soon ground to a reluctant and despairing halt."[80] The demise of the Department of Education took place in 1958 with the granting of the last Ph.D.

The story of how a tenured professor with an endowed chair and an inter-

---

[78] Abraham Flexner, *Universities: American, English, German* (New York: Oxford University Press, 1930), 99-104, 111, 156-57.

[79] For the early years of the teaching of Education at Harvard, see Paul H. Hanus, *Adventuring in Education* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1937), 102-50. For a sketch of a longer period, see: Arthur G. Powell, "A Historical Perspective," in *Report of the Harvard Committee, The Graduate School of Education* (Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1966), 77-99.

[80] John S. Brubacher *et al.*, *The Department of Education at Yale University: 1891-1958* (New Haven: n.p., 1960), 44.

national reputation as a scholar and teacher in educational history and philosophy and who was acknowledged by the liberal-arts graduates as a master of the Socratic technique in instruction, was deprived of his moral right to teach the courses he had been teaching for many years remains to be told. Professor John S. Brubacher was assured his tenure, but he could not endure the anguish of being a teacher without students, except during a brief period as a welcomed guest in the Yale Divinity School. The American Association of University Professors did not intervene because its policy required the deprivation of tenure before it could conduct an investigation. The definition of academic tenure evidently was too narrow to cover the loss of teaching freedom by Professor Brubacher. The formation of the Brubacher Investigation Committee, with the writer as chairman, by the societies representing the history and philosophy of education and comparative education, was an attempt to raise the issue of academic freedom when the A.A.U.P. was silent. The voluntary departure of Professor Brubacher to the University of Michigan made it inadvisable to continue to work for a restoration of his status at Yale.[81]

Here we have a clear example of the victory of power over the fundamental principle of freedom. The program of teacher education favored by President Griswold superseded that of the Department of Education. Instead of resolving the differences by discussion and cooperation, the President, indubitably supported by faculty members of other departments, imposed a decision through the use of power.

The situation at Yale was a practical outcome of decades of denigration of Education as a field of study and of opposition to traditional teacher education. The pressure against Pedagogy in the universities can be traced in discussions and in documentary form, and in periodicals and books dealing with

---

[81]The writer has a file of unpublished materials on the Brubacher case.

educational subjects.[82] Defenses and counterattacks by proponents of Education and academicians convinced of its value were often ignored. A recent instance of this type was the debate concerning research in the history of education.[83]

When one side in an educational controversy is convinced, as it were, of its rectitude and of the villainy of its opponents, it can argue by word of mouth and word of pen. It is when other tactics are adopted that conflicts and crises arise. What we mean is the exclusion by the powerful group of those with whom they disagree from teaching positions and from publications. Such actions have taken place in such fields as sociology, psychology, and political science. It has happened, but it is difficult to document with exactitude, understandably enough, in the fields of educational history and philosophy and in comparative education. It is unfortunate that difference of theory and practice are not brought out into the open when there is competition for teaching posts and periodical and book space. Apart from the considerations of academic ethics, there is the matter of substituting power for persuasion. Such behavior is not consistent with the nature and functions of a university. Furthermore, if we may cite Lord Acton, "Power tends to corrupt, and absolute power corrupts absolutely."

The period of power conflict and crises has been with us for some time. Teachers' negotiations and strikes, teachers' activities of a political nature,

---

[82] The literature is too vast to be cited even on a selective basis. Not well-known are the anonymous articles attacking and defending the professor of pedagogy in the *Unpopular Review*, Vol. V, Jan.-March, 1916, 64-65; Vol. V, April-June, 1916, 349-60; and Vol. VI, July-September, 1916, 58-72.

[83] *e.g.*, Bernard Bailyn, *Education in the Forming of American Society* (Chapel Hill: University of North Carolina Press, 1960); and Lawrence A. Cremin, *The Wonderful World of Ellwood Patterson Cubberley: An Essay on the Historiography of American Education* (New York: Teachers College Press, 1965). See also the evaluation of their position by William W. Brickman, "Revisionism and the Study of the History of Education," *History of Education Quarterly*, IV, December, 1964, 209-29; and "L.A. Cremin's Appreciation of American Education," *Journal of Thought*, Vol. 3, April, 1968, 80-89.

and other moves involving muscle and campaigns utilizing *clout* have been under way.[84] These tendencies deserve careful, dispassionate, scholarly analysis. Unfortunately, this essay does not provide the opportunity. Nor does the writer feel competent to make the needed type of study of the problems of pedagogical power.

In conclusion, our sketch of some historical and international experiences with the troika of conflict-crisis-power shows frequently the prevalance of passion over patience, of repression over reason, of subjectivity over science. One approach to solve this problem is to counter power with power. This is not the way of a person of learning and character. Let it be hoped, *Orandum est*, as Juvenal put it, that modesty, humility, cooperativeness and other virtues by which man is kind and just with man will replace the attitude of man being a wolf unto man. This is a utopian wish for the world at large, but one not impossible of attainment to a reasonable degree. The thought is father to the deed.

---

[84] See: Myron Lieberman and Michael Moskow, *Collective Negotiations for Teachers: An Approach to School Administration* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1966) Stanley Elam, Myron Lieberman, and Michael H. Moskow,eds., *Readings on Collective Negotiations in Public Education* (Chicago: Rand McNally, 1967) and Alan Rosenthal, *Pedagogues and Power: Teacher Groups in School Politics* (Syracuse: Syracuse University Press, 1969).

EXPECTATION VS. REALITY: BEHAVIORAL SCIENCE RESPONSE TO TEACHER EDUCATION DEMAND

Don C. Charles
Iowa State University

In the twentieth century, education and psychology (or more broadly today, behavioral science) have been joint enterprises. The process of learning and adjusting in school and society intrigued students of behavior even before the advent of scientific methods. The problems generated by the broadened base of public education in the early decades of this century demanded evidence on which to base effective new policies. Thus for decades, American education has posed questions which behavioral science has been struggling to answer. The preparation of teachers has been a special area of concern.[1] It is my observation however that supply and demand in this "joint enterprise" (teacher education demand and behavioral science supply) have been getting further apart. It is the purpose of this paper to examine briefly the history of this relationship, to attempt to identify disparities of demand and response, and to offer some suggestions for improvement.

A LITTLE HISTORY

The association of psychology and education had its genesis in William James, the great physiologist, psychologist, and philosopher of Harvard in the years bridging the end of the nineteenth and the beginning of the twentieth century. James was a true scholar, at home in the Old and the New World, an engaging writer (more readable than his famous brother Henry, to some) and a popular speaker. In 1892, he was persuaded to discuss

---

[1] It is not possible to distinguish sharply between the needs of teacher education and education in general so I will discuss them separately where possible and jointly where necessary.

psychology in relation to school with the teachers of Cambridge where he lived. The lectures were well-received and he was invited to give the same series or to cover the same topics in many places including the Chatauqua circuit. He needed the money earned from the lectures to pay for remodeling a summer home but did not find the association with teachers stimulating or rewarding, as has been true for many succeeding scholars. His lack of enthusiasm for the activity was expressed in a letter commenting on the female teachers of his audience, "I have never seen more women and less beauty, heard more voices and less sweetness, perceived more earnestness and less triumph that I ever supposed possible." In another letter to his wife he further commented on his experiences with his teacher audiences: ". . . meeting minds so earnest and helpless that it takes them half an hour to get from one idea to its immediately adjacent next neighbor" and then "they lie down on it . . . like a cow on a doormat, so that you can get neither in nor out with them." (James, 1896).

Despite his distaste for the process, the lectures prospered and in 1899 they were published as *Talks to Teachers on Psychology and to Students on Some of Life's Ideals* (James, 1899).

James' psychology for teachers was functional: the child was seen as an active organism and it was education's obligation to be consistent with the child's instincts and yet fit him for life in society. While James' instinct orientation was abandoned, his influence made inroads into the existing faculty psychology and the success of his self-described "practical, concrete application" of psychology for teachers (James, 1892) helped bring the attention of later psychologists to the child in the classroom.

One of these psychologists was a student (though not a follower) of James, G. S. Hall. Hall emphasized the difference between a *scholiocentric* and a *pedocentric* orientation; instead of fitting the child to the school, the school was to fit the child. His books, *Adolescence* (1904) and *Educational Problems* (1911) helped shift the focus of the educator's attention to the child's characteristics, development, and needs. This focus in turn created a demand for

research evidence on the child.

Psychology as a research-based science with a focus on education flowered in the work of Edward Thorndike, another early student of James. Thorndike was the first true educational psychologist. In his work both at Harvard and Columbia, he developed to a high level scientific laboratory study of animal behavior, especially learning behavior and quantitative treatment of data. Out of this research he generated a learning theory called *Connectionism.* Responding to the urging of his mentor at Columbia, J. McKeen Cattell, he began using children as subjects. From both animal and human research he developed his *law of effect,* which was destined to have a powerful influence on American education. Through the *law of effect,* behavior was seen as dependent upon the organism's success or failure, reward or punishment, or satisfaction or annoyance. By putting responsibility for behavior on learning, which in turn was conditioned by experience, Thorndike freed psychology from its dependence on *mind* and instincts to explain behavior. At the same time, greater responsibility was placed on the school to structure classroom experiences that would produce the most efficient learning, rather than on the child to grasp whatever the school cast before him. Thorndike organized his ideas into a book on educational psychology in 1903, and by 1913 produced a massive three-volume work on the topic (Thorndike, 1903, 1913). His earlier work was concerned primarily with the origin and nature of individual uniqueness in children, while the latter went on to consider transfer of training, the study of individual differences by way of intelligence test construction, and to production and encouragement of quantitative methods in research. Other scholars followed him, and by the 1920's there was a sizeable group of psychologists working at educational problems.

At about the same time John Dewey, psychologist-philosopher, was asking that the child's nature be a source of inspiration for the curriculum (Dewey, 1902).

Neither educational nor scientific movements occur in a cultural vacuum, of course. The rise of educational psychology occurred simultaneously with broadening of the base and modifying the nature of public education. This "transformation of the schools," to borrow a phrase from Lawrence Cremin (1961), demanded better understanding of the learning (and thus of the teaching) process, which the new science seemed to promise.

Because of the increasing heterogeneity of the student population, better descriptions and understanding of children also were needed. The study of growth and development of children was becoming a discipline known as *child psychology*, in some aspects a part of educational psychology, and in other aspects parallel to it, influenced by a variety of forces (Charles, 1970). Of perhaps greater importance was the testing movement. As early as 1870 tests for identifying individual uniqueness began to evolve but not until development of the Army Alpha intelligence test during World War I was mass, paper-and-pencil testing feasible. Education embraced the testing movement avidly. All kinds of tests were developed and used. Whatever the problem, there was a test designed to measure its dimensions.

Formal training and certification for teachers became more demanding as *normal schools* became *teacher's colleges*. Since the discipline seemed to promise scientific answers to educational problems, psychology became a standard part of the teacher's education. While Thorndike had been held in high regard by his fellow psychologists (he was named president of the American Psychological Association in 1912), this was not true of most educational psychologists. The disdain academic psychologists felt for Education courses led to the establishment of separate departments of educational psychology in many colleges of education. (This disdain has not evaporated. Not long ago I spent some time at one of our greatest universities. In a long corridor separating two wings of the building housing the separate departments was posted a sign: "Educational

Psychology," with an arrow pointing one way, and scribbled on the sign the words "Real Psychology," with the arrow pointing the opposite direction.) Unfortunately in many schools the instructors had no previous acquaintance with any branch of the discipline.

But educational psychology grew and prospered. In the boom education years after World War II, departments expanded and produced large numbers of Ph.D's and Ed.D's (usually indistinguishable except for a greater language requirement in the former.) By 1970 there were more than 2,000 members of Division 15, the Division on Educational Psychology, in the American Psychological Association, plus perhaps as great or greater a number not so allied. With this body of presumably well-trained behavioral scientists available, teacher trainees should be prepared to deal intelligently with both the personal vagaries and academic problems of all children, while at the same time the larger problems of education should have yielded to scientific analysis.

This has not happened, of course. Neither have the problems of pollution, economic distress, nor population pressures been solved. The social promise of science and technology apparent early in this century has not been realized. For reasons that are far too complex to discuss here. But with the background I have just sketched, we can examine the present needs -- demands if you will -- of teacher education and education in general in relation to contemporary behavioral science.

EDUCATION'S DEMANDS

Perhaps the term "demands" has too aggressive a connotation; "need" or "expectation" might be more descriptive of education's approach to behavioral science. But demands are what education should make of a discipline that originated to help support education and whose continued existence should be justified by its usefulness.

But whatever term we use, there are some current problem areas that cry for solution, some specifically in teacher education, and others relevant because trainees must be prepared to deal with them. The items described are suggestive rather than exhaustive and are culled from recent issues of *School Review*, *School and Society*, *Saturday Review* and similar sources. It would be easy to extend the list.

Perceived Needs

One of the fundamental problems is a philosophical one: that is, the purpose of education. Our answers to this seem to me to range over a continuum from therapy at one end to the production of scholars at the other. Since World War II we have seen the pendulum swing from a warm, permissive, child-development emphasis to the "academic excellence" push of the late 1950's and early 1960's. (What the emphasis is now is unclear to me; I hear voices calling for everything from college math in high school to T-groups for everybody.) But as the trend of our century continues, extending the range and inclusiveness of public education, the more insistent the problem of purpose becomes.

A second big and somewhat related problem is that of the school's relation to the community -- the state. That is, having defined or deduced from demands and attitudes of the public what educational objectives should be, how can resources be used for maximum effect? All of us are aware of the frequent failure of proposed bond issues, of attacks by "cut the cost" taxpayer groups in local school board elections, the restriction of funds for higher education. This becomes a psychological problem when one tries to evaluate the effectiveness of teaching techniques to study the impact of innovative devices and techniques and to delineate the relation of individual student characteristics to specific learning experiences. Examples from the recent past and current scene include television, programmed instruction, computer-assisted instruction, aspects of "discovery learning" and the like.

Another problem, or cluster of problems is an old one but more acute than ever before. That is dealing with students as persons.

High school administrators discovered not too long ago that their charges could be as angry, hostile and attacking as any Berkeley mob. *School Management* magazine came out not long ago with "Strategies for Coping with Boycotts, Violence, Sit-Ins." Peter Schrag commented on this piece in *Saturday Review* (1969) ". . . the kids are the enemy, barbarian hordes who have to be conned or co-opted or accommodated. Success is to get the kids 'back into class in short order.'" This year junior high principals are finding that the excitement has moved down a notch. A couple of specifics: drug abuse is moving down into junior high schools and even elementary schools. The incidence of venereal disease is climbing at an accelerating rate in the early teen years. The list is long and painful.

Another aspect of dealing with students as persons is the continuing abrasion of culture, and especially race, differences between teacher and student, and between students. Goodwill is not enough,and the suspicion might be raised that there isn't enough of that around -- either in trainees or their mentors, not to mention the kids.

Overriding these general problems for the individual teacher or trainee is the traditional one of identifying and mastering instructional techniques in specific content areas. How do you go about instructing a room full of students in algebra, in the structure of English, in the safe and efficient operation of a drill-press in the shop? These questions are as old as formal teaching but they have taken on new urgency for several reasons. One of these reasons is that there is more to be taught -- both in variety of subjects and in depth of content. Another is that there seems to be at every level greater expectation in the public and in many students for more meaningful and significant learning, more questioning of results of "being in school" so many years. There has always been grumbling by consumers of education, but less willingness in the past to do something about their discontents than is true

today. Still another addition to stress for the teacher is the before-mentioned increase in range of abilities and cultural background at every school level, coupled with the increase in social expectation of our time.

ANOTHER VIEW OF NEEDS

The topics I have just discussed seem to me to be major areas of concern presented by educators. Now let me report my own observations on some problems for which they ought to be seeking solutions but which do not appear so prominently in current literature as the above.

One of these problems is the nature of the trainee. If he is really representative of his generation and time, he is probably out of tune with at least part of the Education faculty, who as a group tend strongly toward tradition and conservatism. If he is not representative of his generation, he is probably going to find his future students difficult to understand and manage, particularly if his own cultural experience is narrow and limited. In the academic context, content acquisition is no longer enough. (And Education students have rarely been at the top of student grade lists in the past.) What must be acquired by teacher-trainees, as is true of students in all curricula, is the habit and technique of scholarship, so the bewilderingly rapid advances of learning will not leave him behind after a few years in the classroom. Neither appropriate attitudes nor skills of scholarship have always been a part of teacher education.

A second concern is the characteristics of some school administrators. I detect a void between administrators and students that is deeper than the familiar "generation gap." The condition is much like that on college campuses in the recent past; at the college level, however, administrators are either changing or leaving. A gulf similar to that between administrator and student may divide the administrator from many of his teachers, especially younger ones, and from a substantial number of parents.

In my state, at least, the chances are better than 9 out of 10 that any given school administrator is an ex-coach, with all that implies in terms of his value-system and his intellectual and cultural background. In a painful proportion of cases he neither shares in the current culture nor tries to understand it. The newly-perceived rights of students (not to mention teachers) frightens him and his response is the normal one of attacking or fleeing the situation that causes anxiety.

A third condition of concern to me is the tendency not only of educators but of the public in general to think of "education" in terms of formal, graded, classroom schooling. John Goodlad says, "One is forced to ask whether our education system serves even 50 percent of its clientele in reasonably satisfying ways" (Goodlad, 1969). One response to an unprofitable association is to end it. Thus the drop out has always been one product of our school system and always will be; the reasons are as varied as the persons. Not only the school's inadequacies but student characteristics of immaturity, lack of motivation, financial difficulty, pregnancy, and a host of other reasons are causative. We are making a few -- but too few -- gestures in the direction of continuing education for these people, but the number reached is limited. It is conceivable in the future that most of a person's learning might be acquired at intervals throughout life on a demand or need basis, rather than through the present rigid grade system.

Whether change as profound as this occurs there will still be a tremendous number of potential adult students. Because of cultural and population changes more people survive infancy, thus living into maturity or old age. But relatively little has been done for these *older learners* as I have called them in another paper (Charles, 1971); traditional adult education, worthwhile as it may be, does not meet their needs.

Even if education wanted to move vigorously in this direction, there are deficiencies of knowledge that must be remedied first. More detailed data on how adults learn is necessary. (College sophomores are adults, sort of, but I mean *real* adults running around loose.) Information must be secured on effective teaching techniques to use with adults and older persons; almost nothing is in the literature on this topic now. Finally, teachers need to be trained to work within a learning context with older persons; because of the lack of scientifically sound techniques, they must be teacher-researchers.

SUMMARIZING EDUCATION'S DEMANDS AND NEEDS

Areas of demand, or at least need, for help appear to be: *redefinition of the objectives and expectations of public education, dealing intelligently with students as persons, adjusting to modifications of the community (state) view and treatment of the school, plus the traditional concern for specific, content-oriented instructional techniques. I add to this list my own observations of need for help with selection and education, especially in the cultural social context of teacher trainees, social-cultural rehabilitation (or negative promotion) of many administrators, and the development of adequate programs and techniques for mature and out-of-school learners.*

Behavioral Science Response to Education's Demands

With at least this particular list of needs or demands before us, we can examine the appropriateness and adequacy of psychology's response. First, a bit more history. For a number of reasons educational psychologists like scholars in most disciplines have tended to become specialists. Today the new Ph.D from a graduate program in educational psychology will be likely to describe himself as a researcher or practitioner in counseling and guidance, human development, measurement, or learning. In addition, he is likely to specialize further within one of these components of educational psychology. He may for example be quite uninterested in the complex learning of the classroom since his work is confined exclusively to the memorizing of serial word

lists. He is, in fact, under some pressure to behave in this fashion; I recall a letter describing a young job applicant to my department as an "old-fashioned educational psychologist." The term was used pejoratively, apparently because the fellow was interested in schooling in general, and had not hacked out a distinct research area for himself. Also it is my observation that it is a rare educational psychologist these days who has ever functioned as a teacher in a public school classroom; the kinds of persons who aspire to become psychologists are not the kinds of persons who aspire originally to become classroom teachers.

It is not sheer willfulness that structures the educational psychologist's career of course. He is simply responding to our university reward system. A bright undergraduate will be encouraged by advisers to apply immediately to graduate school, rather than to teach for a while. If he fares well in graduate school, he will be encouraged to focus his talents, get some work published and thus be highly employable. On his new job he can make the biggest splash by getting a grant and grinding out papers and articles. In fact, continued employment may depend on a specific number of publications per year if the department has a reputation to maintain. In short, he cannot *afford* to teach in public school, to involve himself with complex problems of education, or to spend time with teachers or administrators.

Because of the focus of his work, he must seek an appropriate outlet for his papers and articles. Thus he becomes a member of American Personnel and Guidance Association, American Educational Research Association, Society for Research in Child Development, or some more specialized group in addition to his possible Division 15 affiliation. These are all admirable organizations, but they are not always very close to the practical and pressing problems of the school.

Since his success will be determined primarily by his produced work, it should be instructive to examine current journal content. Therefore, I looked

at two issues (June and October 1970) of what would seem to be the most appropriate publication for our purposes, the *Journal of Educational Psychology*.

In these two presumably typical issues, there were 25 research studies reported. Of the twenty-five, fourteen or 56 percent of the studies used college students as subjects (usually sophomores enrolled in psychology classes) and thus had little direct relevance to school problems. Of the topics treated, half were verbal-learning studies and the rest were scattered among college aptitude testing, cognition, programmed instruction, etc. The remaining 44 percent of studies using school-age children as subjects were concerned with learning (content, retention, achievement, and inquiry), IQ and personality tests, the structure of language, teacher-pupil relations, and disadvantaged and college-bound adolescents. I think it is fair to judge that only four or five of the 25 topics bear even a slight immediate relationship to the problems or demands discussed earlier. The pieces were of course, quite appropriately, written for other educational psychologists and would not be very meaningful to many teachers or administrators. The President of Division 15, John Flanagan, commented in 1970, "Unfortunately, the current reward system tends to encourage the conduct and reporting of basic research. The professional journals in the field of educational psychology seek and publish small studies concerning very specific points which advance our understanding of education only very slowly and uncertainly."

But a major part of the university educational psychology faculty's work-load consists of instructing teacher-trainees. How satisfactory is this effort, that is, how well-prepared are new teachers to deal with the problems described earlier? The difficulty of evaluating the outcomes of teaching is painfully familiar, so we really are not very clear about the contribution. Students are rarely enthusiastic about their educational psychology courses. For example, Grinder (1970) at Wisconsin reported that students there *disdained* educational psychology courses *per se*, but felt the *topics* were relevant to

their needs. Flanagan (1970) commented that "several studies have shown that persons lacking training in educational psychology are as effective in promoting student learning as teachers who have had this training." Thus neither student judgment nor research evaluation gives much support for the value of the usual educational psychology courses.

To this point, I have been very hard on my colleagues, and thus on myself But is Education just a poor suppliant whose problems are ignored by the bad scientist? I think not. For the most part psychologists are not often asked or even permitted to be involved in the vital problems of education. They are too seldom invited to sit in on curriculum discussions. Not enough psychologists are asked to participate in the development or evaluation of instructional materials and equipment. Innovations too infrequently have psychological evaluation devices *built in* so that effects can be quickly ascertained. (In my community,psychologists are not allowed any access to students in the schools. Fortunately we have neighboring cities not so hostile, thus saving us from studying only college sophomores.) Psychologists are too seldom asked to clarify goals of education, to reduce cultural barriers, or to extend the range and effectiveness of the schools by relating learner characteristics and educational techniques. What they have been asked to do most frequently is to design and administer tests; the cumulative balance of good and ill in this enterprise seems at least questionable to me. But in total, Education has not seemed in recent years to seek much from psychology, thus making it unsurprising that the science has not responded more profitably to the great problems of our times. The reluctance of Education to engage the full talents of behavioral science is a product I believe not of willfulness or rejection but of lack of understanding of the present capacity of psychology to solve problems.

Reconciliation of Supply and Demand

What is needed to bring behavioral science capabilities to bear more effectively on education's needs? One solution is to demand reform of the science and profession of educational psychology. One cannot be against reform, particularly when it is apparent that things are not ideal in a given area. Educational psychology however has simply reflected some of the general malaise of the university in recent years: too exclusive a concern with often trivial *research*, neglect of undergraduates in favor of Ph.D students, disdain for applied work, values not closely related to society's needs, and the like. But these conditions have affected all of higher education and are responding to internal as well as student and public pressures for change. Educational psychology as a whole has not really departed far from its traditional role as provider of scientific evidence on all important school functions. Let me quote from the message of the APA Division 15 president in 1970:

"*Formulating the functions of an educational system is the responsibility of philosophers, educational psychologists, and the public. . . . The educational psychologist has responsibility for focusing on the total performance of students both during and following their exposure to a specific educational system in such a way that philosophers, scholars, educators and the public can evaluate the individual outcomes in terms of whatever personal and social values they wish to apply. . . . Many educational psychologists believe that by systematically applying well established psychological concepts and principals, dramatic improvement in instructional materials and methods could be achieved . . . . The educational psychologist . . . can make a major contribution to the relatively new field of guidance and individual planning.*" (Flanagan, 1970)

These brief excerpts suggest that the discipline of educational psychology has not rejected its historical role, even though its performance has not been always up to its ideals. There is reason also I think to look for improvement of performance in the near future. I have sensed in many leaders of the field in recent meetings an impatience with some inadequacies of the past, and a conviction that improvement is under way. The current Division 15 president, Herbert Klausmeier, (1970) comments, "Until recently, most research and the occasional development activities in educational psychology have been of a project type of uneven quality . . . since 1964 that federal government has funded programmatic research and development activities which are showing a high payoff. The research and development efforts of educational psychologists . . . now hold much promise for generating powerful theoretical models and instructional systems that contribute directly to the improvement of educational practice."

Reformed or not, another possible solution to deficiencies of educational psychology is to cry for *relevance* --to demand that all research be applied and that scientists become practitioners. As I have commented, there has been far too much trivial and meaningless research and too little willingness to work at complex problems. As we all know, abandoning research leaves us soon with scientific Band-Aids rather than serums to treat causes. What scientist knows where his abstract and even playful theorizing and research will lead? We do indeed need technology, but we must not abandon research because it seems to have no immediate payoff. As one scientist replied in rebuttal to a criticism of basic research, "Of what use is a baby?" Without abandoning basic research, we must insist in the universities and granting agencies that useful, meaningful and applied work is rewarded; after all, it was Thorndike's *law of effect* that pointed to the tendency to continue or repeat whatever behavior was rewarded.

The inadequacy of much educational psychology instruction is well-documented. The reasons are identical with reasons for inadequacy in other curricula: staffs too small or inappropriately trained, little reward for effort expended on improving teaching, and students sometimes deficient in ability and background. But these inadequacies too are being attacked; innovative and promising approaches to the teaching of this foundation content are being tried in many teacher education schools. We have had reports on some of these programs here at our Society of Professors of Education meetings, and plans are under way for devoting part of a forthcoming issue of the *Journal of Teacher Education* to this topic.

While improvement of the nature and quality of research and teaching in educational psychology is vital, something more is needed if the discipline is to make a significant contribution to education in this dismayingly complex part of the twentieth century. It seems to me that some new kind of communication must be established between the producer and consumer -- the behavioral scientist and the educational practitioner. The producer has usually neither the time nor the inclination to bring his knowledge and skill in usable form to the classroom teacher, trainee, or administrator. The practitioner has given up seeking this kind of help with his major problems because he has received so little in the recent past.

I believe this communication can be effected only by a person who has an intimate, experience-based knowledge of public school classroom and administration, and who also has a broad and functional knowledge of contemporary educational psychology acquired in a good graduate department. I do not believe that channeling new Ph.D's into such roles (even if the positions existed) would satisfy this need. In fact I wonder whether the Ph.D (or Ed.D) is at all appropriate as background for such innovative work. Most of us who train Ph.D's try to create them in our own images, thus producing more scholars and researchers. What is needed is a new kind of specialist.

One potential source of behavioral science aid in solving the greater problems of the schools might exist in the gradual transformation of an existing specialty, the school psychologists. Traditionally these workers have functioned as an arm of Special Education. But some leaders of school psychology are expressing disillusionment with the medical-model, test-giving, clinical orientation, and with the growing behavior-modification cult. These professionals might become true *educational psychologists* fulfilling the promise of James, Judd, and Thorndike earlier in the century. Properly selected and trained by the university, and properly utilized by administrations, this new kind of school psychologist could help mightily to solve both the technical and the people-problems of our time.

Many factors militate against this solution -- a distressingly high proportion of contemporary school psychologists are only marginal clinicians, with little interest and less competence in the institutional problems of the schools. High quality, research-oriented departments of educational psychology would be in many cases reluctant to soil their academic hands training applied workers. Many school administrations are content, as consumers of psychological work, to settle for test scores categorizing a sufficient number of students as mentally deficient, making them eligible for Special Education and thus for state aid. But it would be *possible*, as is true in so many contexts in our society, if public agencies -- university departments and the public schools -- would be willing to work together.

Another more innovative solution may be found. But at this point I feel that behavioral science is providing our nation's schools with little help in dealing with what are perhaps the most acute problems of our history. It does not have to be that way if a channel can be established to bring what behavioral science knows and can do to the consumer who needs the knowledge and skill.

Charles, D. C.,"Historical Antecedents of Life-Span Developmental Psychology," in R. Goulet and P. Bates, eds., *Life-Span Developmental Psychology* (New York: Academic Press, 1970), 24-53.

Charles, D.C., "The Older Learner,"*Educational Forum*,in press, 1971.

Cremin, L. A., *The Transformation of the School: Progressivism in American Education, 1876-1957* (New York: Knopf, 1961).

Dewey, J., *The Child and the Curriculum* (Contributions to Education, No. 5) (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1902).

Flanagan, J., President's message, "The Functions of Educational Psychologists," *Educational Psychologist*,Division 15 Newsletter, A.P.A., 7, 1970, p. 8.

Ibid., 1-8.

Goodlad, J., "The Schools vs. Education," *Saturday Review*, April 19, 1969, 60.

Grinder, R., "Flexibility and Sequence: Educational Psychology and the Training of Teachers," (paper presented at symposium, "The Crisis of Content in Educational Psychology Courses," American Educational Research Association, Minneapolis, March, 1970. Department of Educational Psychology, University of Wisconsin, 936 Johnson St., Madison, Wisconsin, 53706.

Hall, G. S., *Adolescence* (New York: Appleton, 1904), 2 vols.

Hall, G. S., *Educational Problems* (New York: Appleton, 1911).

James, William, *Talks to Teachers on Psychology: and to Students on Some of Life's Ideals* (New York: Henry Holt, 1899).

James, William, Letter to his wife, July 24, 1896, cited in G. W. Allen, *William James* (New York: Viking, 1967), 384.

James, William, Letter to Rosina Emmet, August 2, 1896, cited by G. W. Allen, *William James* (New York: Viking Press, 1967), 384.

Klausmeier, H. J., "The Education in Educational Psychology," *Educational Psychology*, 8, 1970, p. 3.

Schrag, Peter, "Gloom at the Top," *Saturday Review*, August 16, 1969, 50.

Thorndike, E. L., *Educational Psychology* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1903).

Thorndike, E. L., *Educational Psychology* (New York: Columbia University, 1913, Vol. I); (New York: Teachers College. 1913, Vols II, III).

VALUE CONFLICT, RIGHTS, AND TEACHER EDUCATION

Joe Park
Northwestern University

The theme of this conference, "Responding to Crises in Teacher Education" asserts that teacher education is afflicted, not by a crisis, but by crises. Is this the case?

A crisis is a point in time when it is decided whether any affair or course of action must be continued or be drastically modified or terminated. A crisis is often compared to that stage in the progress of a disease, such as pneumonia, when the turning point occurs that determine whether the patient lives or dies. A crisis is not a minor day-to-day shift of events but, instead, is a striking change in the course of affairs. Using the criterion of *turning point* or *striking change* suggested in the above definition, it hardly seems that teacher education itself is in a crisis. Perhaps it would be more prudent to say that if teacher education is in a crisis, those of us in teacher education do not appear to be particularly aware of it, or do not care to admit it, or have not been able to articulate very clearly the precise nature of the crisis.

This is not to say that the nation and higher education are not in a crisis. Certainly we can aver that the national forces playing upon teacher education at this time are quite strong. In the remainder of this paper I shall focus upon one of these forces, namely the conflict of values. Moreover I shall discuss the problem of maintaining civil and academic rights in an era highlighted by value conflict.

A. Value Conflict and Teacher Education

Historically, teacher education has been a rather tame and conservative enterprise that has reflected the complexions of our society. Seldom, if ever, has it been the forerunner of educational or social change. Modifications that have occurred in teacher education usually have been the product of some larger social movement rather than the result of events arising within teacher education itself. For example, the establishment of teacher training institutions followed the demands for common schools. The lengthening of the period of academic preparation for teachers was, in large part, a product of an oversupply of teachers during the depression, and the general growth in knowledge of the late nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. More recently the concern for education in the inner city followed the social awareness of the blacks.

Thus, I should like to hypothesize that something of the same sort is happening today. That is to say that teacher education is being forced into a period of re-examination because of a rather widespread and vigorous reassessment of our cultural values and priorities. Whether this has caused, or will cause, a genuine crisis in teacher education can be left for historians to record. What I want to point out is that we are seeing somewhat more clearly the inconsistencies in the American value structure. The recognition of these inconsistencies is causing us to reappraise our various institutional structures by which we attempt to realize our values. Teacher education is carried on within an institution and it has not, and cannot, remain completely immune from change. As Robert H. Finch recently said: "We should not expect our educational institutions to be free from conflict and tension among competing values when our society as a whole is fraught with these very tensions."

There is, however, another and competing hypothesis that has been advanced by Robert Bendiner. He has stated his hypothesis in the following terms:

> *If an amateur may join in the game of interpreting the terrible restlessness of the times, I would hazard the guess that it is not so much the great issues of the day that are producing the malaise as it is the sheer discomfort, the abrasiveness and frustration of day-to-day life. It is all too easy to believe that the society is disintegrating when, in this most technologically advanced country in the world, the telephone system is running down, the railroads are a scandal, local transportation is a daily trial of the flesh and the spirit, the mails barely get through even when postal employees are working, dirt and noise are everywhere, and even the national parks have become a national disgrace.*[1]

In the same issue of *The New York Times Magazine*, Margaret Mead appears to support Bendiner when she is reported to have said:

> *The kids who are now 20 have had to live through 15 years of adult incompetence, their inability to cope with the contemporary world. I don't blame the adults either because the changes were so radical, but at the same time, the kids have inferred that this is an unmanageable world. So why shouldn't they feel helpless about managing it?*[2]

In mentioning this competing hypothesis, I have no intention of abandoning my own. Instead, I would hold that the aforementioned recognized inconsistencies within the American value system, which I claim are a cause, perhaps a major cause of the present re-evaluation of our institutional structures, can be more plainly seen if one constructs a set of defining characteristics for three of our basic value laden terms: democracy, capitalism, and the good life. It will have to be admitted, however, that the defining characteristics are by nature stipulative and programmatic. Some undoubtedly will want to take some exception to them. Recognizing this hazard, and in

---

[1]Robert Bendiner, "Great Expectations, A Quarter of a Century Later," *The New York Times Magazine*, April 26, 1970, 54.

[2]David Dempsey, "The Mead and Her Message, Some Field Notes on an Anthropological Phenomenon," *The New York Times Magazine*, April 26, 1970, 77.

an attempt to find more secure basis than mere personal whim, the *Encyclopedia of Philosophy* and the *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences* were consulted for defining characteristics for democracy and capitalism. The definition of the third term, "the good life" was derived from a reading of Bertrand Russell's, *The Conquest of Happiness*. Let us now turn to definitions.

Democracy can be viewed as a form of government or a way of life. The source for our definition emphasizes less the governmental form and stresses, instead, a way of life in which the chief ideal is equality for all. To be specific, the defining characteristics are political equality, equality of economic opportunity, social equality, religious equality, legal equality, and the improvement of the general welfare.[3]

Capitalism appears to be dominated by three main ideas. First among these is acquisition, especially the acquisition of money, wealth, and property. The second is competition, or the freedom to acquire wealth uninhibited by regulations. The third is economic rationality or the strict adaptation of means to ends, the careful evaluation of procedures of production and the employment of the most serviceable workers.[4]

Like democarcy and capitalism, the characteristics of the good life are not universally agreed upon. But certainly the good life includes some such features as health, food, shelter, feeling of acceptance, love, satisfaction with one's work, and a certain degree of freedom of thought and movement.[5]

If we examine and compare the definitions given these terms here, certain value inconsistencies and contradictions immediately becomes apparent. We are forced into asking whether it is possible to achieve this is a

---

[3] Paul Edwards (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Philosophy*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1967, Vol. 2, pp. 328-341.
[4] Edwin Seligman & Alvin Johnson (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Social Sciences*, New York: The Macmillan Co., 1930, Vol. 3, pp. 195-208.
[5] Bertrand Russell, *The Conquest of Happiness*, New York: The New American Library, 1951, pp. 138-142.

society which embraces both capitalism and democracy. The answer seems quite clear to many. We cannot achieve equality of economic opportunity and the unrestricted accumulation of wealth at the same time. We cannot promote the love of our fellow man when we take labor to be a commodity to be purchased, used, and discarded. We cannot promote the general welfare while operating on the principle of the survival of the fittest. Many of us who have concluded this are demanding some reordering of our values and priorities so that competition and accumulation become subordinated to the achievement of the good life. We are urging that the health of all be preserved from the effects of pollution, even if it necessitates a de-escalation of the economy. We are pressing for a legal system that provides equal justice for all, and not just for those with money and privilege. We are asking whether food, shelter, and education should be determined by the accidents of birth and fortune or whether all of us are entitled to them because we are human beings. We are inquiring whether schooling is a means of enlightenment and opportunity or a tool for preserving the status quo. It is the asking of questions of this sort that has brought the whole problem of value priority across the threshold of institutions preparing teachers. As a result of this, our institutions have been directly affected in a number of vital ways. Faculty and students have used their institutions as a base for operations against persons and other institutions as well as a refuge from persecution and prosecution when they have run amuck of resistance and the law. Faculty and students have attacked persons, practices, and divisions of their own institutions as symbols of the status quo. In effect they have sought to destroy parts of the body of the very institution that provides them with intellectual nourishment and serves as their adytum. The logic of this seems to be that it is better for one to cut off the arm that offends than for the whole body to roast in the hell of inequality.

Still another vital and simultaneous impact upon our institutions of teacher education has been the counter-attack of alumni, boards of trustees, legislatures and the like because of their disapproval of activities on the part of the faculty and students. This has led to the dismissing of students, the firing of faculty members, the curtailing of finances, and the restriction of freedom of expression and dissent. I shall return to this matter of freedom of expression and dissent in the latter part of this paper.

While these events have been going on in our institutions as a whole, what has been happening in those subdivisions called departments and schools of education? Some of our faculty and students have actually sought change, and have been in the forefront of organizational activity. For the most part, however, our departmental faculties have not been as actively engaged in social protest as members of certain other divisions of our universities. Nor do they seem to have been widely involved in protests directed at their own departments and institutions. Essentially, the same thing can be said for the students in education. Our departments and schools of education have been left pretty much alone to operate at their leisure. Of course they have been widely criticized for one reason or another. To be sure there have been the occasional confrontation over grades, examinations, admissions policies, and financial aid. But they have not been the objects of protest and destruction such as the placement bureaus, the ROTC buildings, the admission offices, and the campus research institutes contributing to the war effort. No one seems bent on attacking or bombing a department or a school of education because it is a symbol of the status quo in education, such as the ROTC or a mathematics research center is thought of as a symbol of the military establishment. Whether this will continue remains to be seen. But why should it have been true to date? Several intriguing but not equally plausible reasons readily come to mind.

Could it be that change comes about more rapidly in teacher education than in other divisions of institutions of higher learning? Could it be that teacher education is ahead of the hounds? The evidence for this viewpoint is not overwhelming although it may be the case in certain institutions. Teachers College, Columbia University came out of the Columbia University upheaval looking rather good or so it is alleged. Could it be that professors and students in teacher education are more complacent and conservative than most of the university community? This is to say that the conservative nature of our faculty and students has saved us, at least, from attack from within. There may be some substance to this thesis since students and professors in teacher education are probably very near, or only very slightly left of political center. But this would not explain why school teachers, and a significant segment of the general public, have not carried out widespread demonstrations or uprisings against schools or departments of education. Could it be that we are thought not to matter very much and that consequently no one seriously believes that a protest directed against teacher education would have much effect on the reordering of our values? Changes in schooling can be achieved by other approaches. Curriculum can be modified by legislative action or through direct negotiations with school administrators and teachers. The technology of education does not have to wait upon departments of education since it is created, designed, manufactured, and sold by industry direct to schools. The ends of education are usually generated by the dominate power groups in the society. Financial support is derived from taxation, foundations, gifts, and tuition, and is in no way dependent upon schools or departments of education. Even the means of education have not been sufficiently determined by advances in the science of education so that the art of educating is primarily dependent upon what is researched and taught in schools of education. Why, then, does anyone really believe the activities of departments

and schools of education to be crucial? Schools and departments of education can be left to continue in their benign and naive ways or they can be left to wither on the academic vine.

Suppose, however, it came to be widely believed that schooling has not been the unmixed blessing we have thought it to be, because it has avoided the critical assessment of our values, beliefs, and institutions and practices, and as a consequence it serves as an effective tool for the preservation of the status quo. In point of fact, this view of schooling is rather widely held at this time. Suppose, still further, that the way we educate our teachers is seen as a direct cause of this failure. Recently Harold Taylor told us that all too often a boy or girl who is going to be a teacher and thus is in a position to break the hold of intellectual rubbish and apathy is taught in school to accept the competitive academic, social, economic, and national systems through his elementary and high school years. He is then given what is essentially four more years of the same thing in some college and then fed back into the schools where he is expected to keep it all going much as it is. Thus teachers are prepared for the role of faithful civil servants in which proficiency in knowledge and skills is valued higher than the ability and willingness to judge discriminately in the choice of educational means and ends and the fortitude to affirm one's value choices in his life and in his teaching.[6]

To the extent that these suppositions are true, teacher education has planted fertile seeds of discontent which may sprout a crop of protest. Forays from the outside could conceivably directly confront schools and departments in a manner similar to that used against university centers engaged in military research. If this were to occur, some of our colleagues are certain to defend what is being done by schools or departments of education.

---

[6] Harold Taylor, *Students without Teachers: The Crisis in the University* (New York: McGraw-Hill Book Company, 1969).

Other students and faculty would join the dissenters. Thus the house would be further divided against itself than it is at present. Whether this occurs or not, we are all already caught up in the updraft of social upheaval within our society brought on, I have maintained, by inconsistencies among our priorities and our avowed ideals. An attack upon teacher education would only bring this upheaval another step closer to us all.

In a time of social upheaval, marked by sharp debate and violent confrontations, our civil liberties become more precious than ever. It is also a time when these liberties are most likely to be denied. In the last year or so there has been a flurry of activity to protect our society from "revolutionary terrorism." It has been recommended that the domestic intelligence apparatus of wire taps and bugging be expanded. The House Internal Security Committee prepared a list of "pied pipers of pernicious propaganda" while the Pentagon compiled and computerized a list of risks to our internal security. The Post Office has opened and read some of our letters from overseas. Even the little children have not been immune for it was suggested, but fortunately discarded, that a test be given all 6 to 8-year olds to determine whether they were inclined toward future criminal behavior. Most recently the election revealed a desire on the part of some to control the news media as well.

Likewise considerable consternation has arisen over Title X of Public Law 91-452. Among other things this law provides that a prosecuting attorney who believes a defendant over twenty-one to be a dangerous special offender may file with the court a notice requesting the court to imprison the defendant for not more than twenty-five years. A special offender is defined as: (1) one who has been previously convicted for two or more offenses punishable by death or imprisonment in excess of one year. Less than five

years must have elapsed "between the commission of such felony and the defendant's release, on parole . . . or (2) the defendant committed such felony as part of a pattern of conduct which was criminal under applicable law . . . or (3) such felony was, or the defendant committed such felony in furtherance of a conspiracy with three or more other persons . . . ."[7]

Thus one might be subject to imprisonment, not so much for what he has done, but for what he might do.

There is enough of a threat of a police state in these specific acts, and in the expressed reluctance of a majority of our people to enact the Bill of Rights were it put to a vote now, that all of us should be alerted and concerned to preserve the rights of all our citizens. Especially we should be concerned to preserve them for ourselves, but most especially for those among us, faculty and students, who have dared to dissent. Regardless of whether we agree with the dissenters, and I disagree with many of them, the right of dissent does not flow from agreement with the position taken by the dissenters but rest upon the United States Constitution and the laws of the land.

B. RIGHTS OF STUDENT AND FACULTY

The American people are guaranteed certain constitutional rights. Among these are freedom of assembly, freedom of speech, freedom of religion, freedom of the press, and freedom to petition our government for a redress of grievances. We are protected against unreasonable searches and seizures, and we are not to be deprived of life, liberty, or property without due process of law. We have the right to a speedy and public trial by an impartial jury. We are entitled to be confronted by the witnesses against us

---

[7]Public Law 91-542, 91st Congress, S.30, October 15, 1970.

and we, in turn, have the right to compulsory process for obtaining witnesses in our favor. Excessive bail or excessive fines are prohibited and cruel and unusual punishment cannot be legally inflicted. Although these rights reserved to American citizens are fairly generally recognized, it is assumed that the unique position held by teachers and the immaturity of students somehow places upon teachers and students certain restrictions. This point is clearly brought out in Adler vs. Board of Education of New York (1952). Justice Minton in delivering the opinion of the court said:

> *A teacher works in a sensitive area in a schoolroom. There he shapes the attitudes of young minds toward the society in which they live. In this the state has a vital concern. It must preserve the integrity of the schools. That the school authorities have the right and duty to screen officials, teachers, and employees as to their fitness to maintain the integrity of the schools as a part of ordered society cannot be doubted. One's associates, past and present, as well as one's conduct, may properly be considered in determining fitness and loyalty.*[8]

In a dissenting opinion, Justice Black explicitly differed with this view when he charged that the Fineberg law of New York was just another instance

> *. . . of those rapidly multiplying legislative enactments which make it dangerous - this time for school teachers - to think or say anything except what a transient majority happens to approve at the moment . . . . The tendency of such a governmental policy is to mold a people into a common intellectual pattern. Quite a different governmental policy rests on the belief that government should leave the mind and spirit of man absolutely free. Such a governmental policy encourages varied intellectual outlooks in the belief that the best view will prevail. This policy of freedom is in my judgment embodied in the First Amendment and made applicable to the states in the Fourteenth.*[9]

These quotations spotlight the crucial question. Should schools and colleges seek to mold a people into a common, intellectual pattern that conforms to the wishes of a "transient majority" or should they "leave the mind and spirit of man absolutely free?" The answer to this question

---

[8] United States Reports, Vol. 342, 1952.

[9] *Ibid.*

is not a simple categorical *yes* or *no* as it might appear at first. The temptation to fall prey to either-or thinking at this point is great. But this is another instance of a question that calls for a qualified answer. In the first place, a certain degree of social cohesion would appear to be a necessity. In the second place, it does not seem possible to leave the mind and spirit of man *absolutely* free. From birth man must be taught certain habits, customs, beliefs, and skills. Undoubtedly some of these will reflect the biases of his tutors and he will be unable to protect himself from these because his reflective powers will not have matured sufficiently. Therefore, it does not appear that the mind and spirit can be left *absolutely* free. Rather it seems more realistic to argue that freedom of the mind is relative and that it can only be preserved when pupils and students, making due allowance for varying maturity levels, are allowed and encouraged to formulate informed and responsible judgments as independently as is humanly possible.

But if the formulation of intelligent judgments is to mean anything more than an academic exercise, they they must be put into operation. It is precisely at the point of operationalizing judgments that the crux of the conflict lies. So long as a student or professor makes a judgment but doesn't announce it or act upon it, most persons could not care less. A Japanese Kamikaze pilot, for example, could be a Christian if he kept the fact to himself and obeyed his military commander. But let one openly declare his judgment and undertake to act upon it and the likelihood is he would find himself joined by others of similar mind who think him especially wise. However, he will not long enjoy the luxury of support for others will pity or avoid him because of his alleged foolishness. Still others will seek to deal openly and aggressively with him because of his depravity and error. As *The New York Times* editorialized on Sunday, April 26, 1970: "It is in days of doubt that the rights of the unpopular few must be upheld, if the liberties of the many are to remain safe."

It was because of this reality of conflict and doubt that our forefathers amended the Constitution to guarantee us all freedom of inquiry and the right to act as our reason dictated, subject to certain specific restrictions. These rights are intended for faculty and students as well as the general population. Over time there has grown up a considerable body of litigation relative to the rights of students and faculty which can be only briefly reviewed here. But such a review would appear particularly pertinent in light of the concerns of this paper, the recent events on our campuses, and the increasing likelihood of repressive measures being directed at students and faculty. This review will arbitrarily confine itself to four major points.

First among the points to be made is that the rights of all persons, including minors, are supposedly protected by the United States Constitution. Justice Black, concurring with the Court, In re Gault[10], wrote that when a person, infant, or adult is seized by the state, and charged for violating a state criminal law, the Constitution requires that he be treated in accordance with the guarantees of all the provisions of the Bill of Rights. It would be a plain denial of equal protection of the laws to hold, because a person is a child, that he be denied these same constitutional safeguards.

A case that grew out of the suspension of several students from Central Missouri State College, allegedly for contributing to and participating in an unruly and unlawful demonstration, is especially instructive on this point. The decision is quite specific with respect to the essential elements of student process. The court's list includes written charges, ten days notice of hearing before the president or final authority, student's right to advance inspection of the college's affidavits and exhibits, student's right to counsel, student's right to call witnesses or introduce affidavits or exhibits, rights of confrontation, cross examination, and written findings,

[10] *United States Reports*, Vol. 387, 1967.

and finally, the right of either side to make a record at its expense.[11]

Second, the United States Supreme Court in Tinker et. al. vs. Des Moines Independent Community School District et.al.[12] has upheld the right of students to express their opinions in school so long as it does not disrupt the work of the school or class. Fear of disruption is not enough to overcome the right of freedom of expression. It was the opinion of the majority of the Court that this sort of hazardous freedom is the very basis of our national strength and the source of independence and vigor of those who grow up and live in this permissive and often disputatious society. If school officials are to justify the prohibition of a particular expression of opinion, then they must be able to show that the action taken was caused by something more than a mere desire to avoid the discomfort and unpleasantness that always accompanies an unpopular viewpoint.

Justice Black, in a dissenting opinion, claimed that the crucial questions remaining were whether students and teachers may use a school

> *. . . at their whim as a platform for the exercise of free speech - 'symbolic' or 'pure' - and whether the courts will allocate to themselves the function of deciding how the pupil's school day will be spent.*13

Justice Black went on to warn

> *. . . I have never believed that any person has a right to give speeches or engage in demonstrations where he pleases and when he pleases . . . . And I repeat that if the time has come when pupils of state-sponsored schools, kindergartens, grammar schools, or high schools can defy and flout orders of school officials to keep their minds on their own schoolwork, it is the beginning of a new revolutionary era of permissiveness in this country fostered by the judiciary.*[14]

---

[11] Esteban vs. Central Missouri State College, 277 F. Supplement 649 (W.D. Mo., 1967).

[12] *United States Reports*, Vol. 393, 1969.

[13] *Ibid.*

[14] *Ibid.*

Third, there is a recognized right of the state to secure certain kinds of information regarding its employees, but it cannot, in the process, deny certain rights to teachers. For example, the state of Oklahoma required all employees to subscribe to an oath declaring they were not and had not been for five years affiliated directly or indirectly with any party or group whatever which had been officially determined by the U.S. Attorney General, or other authorized agency of the U.S., to be a Communist front or subversive organization. Furthermore, all employees were asked to promise to take up arms in the defense of the United States in time of war or national emergency. The United States Supreme Court overturned the lower court's ruling. It declared the oath unconstitutional on the grounds that the fact of association alone, in this instance, determined disloyalty and disqualification. In a concurring opinion Justice Frankfurter wrote: "They (teachers) must have the freedom of responsible inquiry by thought and action, into the meaning of social and economic ideas, into the checkered history of social and economic dogma.[15] Likewise, the Court declared unconstitutional an Arkansas statute compelling every teacher to file annually an affidavit listing without limitation every organization to which he had belonged or regularly contributed within the preceding five years. The Court stated that many relationships that a teacher would be required to report could have no possible bearing upon the teacher's fitness.[16]

Fourth, the right of inquiry has been upheld by the United States Supreme Court. For example, one Paul Sweezy was invited to lecture at the University of New Hampshire. He was accused of making a statement that socialism was inevitable in America. Subsequently a state court found Sweezy

---

[15] Wieman vs. Updegraff, *United States Reports*, Vol. 344, 1952.

[16] Shelton vs. Tucker, *United States Reports*, Vol. 364, 1960.

to be in contempt and committed him to jail. In the opinion, reversing the conviction of the lower court, Chief Justice Warren held that:

> *The essentiality of freedom in the community of American universities is almost self-evident. No one should underestimate the vital role in a democracy that is played by those who guide and train our youth. To impose any strait jacket upon the intellectual leaders in our colleges and universities would imperil the future of our nation. No field of education is so thoroughly comprehended by man that new discoveries cannot yet be made. Particularly is that true in the social sciences where few, if any, principles are accepted as absolutes. Scholarship cannot flourish in an atmosphere of suspicion and distrust. Teachers and students must always remain free to inquire, to study, and to evaluate, to gain new maturity and understanding; otherwise our civilization will stagnate and die.*[17]

Furthermore, it is quite clear from the text of several other decisions of the United States Supreme Court that teachers and professors have certain rights of inquiry that accrue to them by virtue of their position. Nowhere has this been made more evident or more clear than in the statements of Chief Justice Warren quoted in part above, and in the concurring opinion of Justice Frankfurter in the Wieman vs. Updegraff decision. "It is the special task of teachers to foster those habits of open-mindedness and critical inquiry which alone make for responsible citizens who, in turn, make possible an enlightened and effective public opinion . . . . They must be exemplars of open-mindedness and free inquiry. They cannot carry out this noble task if the conditions for the practice of a responsible and critical mind are denied to them."[18]

These, then, are some of the more important rights that accrue to us as teachers, students, and citizens of the United States. But this brief summary does not do full justice to the topic. Those who wish to go beyond what I have had to say may find the American Civil Liberties Union pamphlet, "Academic Freedom and Civil Liberties of Students in Colleges and Universities," and

---

[17] Sweezy vs. New Hampshire, *United States Reports*, Vol. 354, 1957.

[18] *Op. cit.*

David Fellman, *The Supreme Court and Education* (New York: Teachers College, Columbia University, 1969) very helpful.

Let us then, in conclusion, return to reiterate a presupposition that has been the basic thesis behind much of this part of the paper. It is that the liberties of all should be preserved, and can best be preserved, by guaranteeing them to the least as well as to the greatest among us. This is an opinion not shared by all. Some would deny civil rights to segments of our people on such grounds or pretexts as recial superiority or economic privilege. Others would destroy all our present means for preserving and extending our civil rights because we have not made our legal system work perfectly. Apparently they first would destroy and then perhaps rebuild.

Regarding those who would deny equal rights to all segments of our population, one can hope his words and actions do not lend comfort or aid to them. Rather each of us shall need to redouble our efforts to preserve the rights of all.

Regarding those who would utterly destroy our present means for preserving and extending our liberties, we can only counteract their fulminations, destruction, violence, and the suppression of the rights of some, or many, for the ends of their few, by making our system work, If there ever was a time when teachers and students should act to preserve their constitutional rights for themselves and for others it is in a time of national and institutional crisis. Such a time is upon us now.

WHO KNOWS WHAT'S REALLY GOING ON?
THE PHENOMENOLOGICAL CRISIS IN TEACHER EDUCATION

Van Cleve Morris
University of Illinois at Chicago Circle

I. PROLOGUE

I work in a large, urban state university. It's just eight blocks from here. If its troubles and agonies are any measure, I think it could be classed as the paradigm case of the urban university of our time. It is lashed daily by the demands of the community, but the demands are delivered to us in such a variety of forms that it is difficult to know what they mean. We are asked to be relevant, but what counts as relevance--and what does not--few individuals are prepared to discuss seriously. We are asked to respond to "the urban crisis," but nobody seems concerned about what a university can respond to and what it cannot. In short, we are in the same boat as everybody else these days; so far as the university is concerned, nobody knows what's really going on.

I do not pretend in this paper to say that I do. But I think that I have detected in the emotional firestorm a feature of the predicament which a university can address itself to and think about, namely, a shift in the strategy of higher learning itself--specifically a shift in the strategy governing the conduct of scholarship and inquiry. It so happens that teacher education as a derivative discipline is caught in the squeeze occasioned by this shift in strategy because it is being asked to abandon an earlier set of foundational disciplines and to adopt a new set. And it doesn't know how to do it.

My argument is going to run something like this:

Since its emergence as a professional discipline about seventy-five years ago, teacher education has built its case on the argument that education is a science and that its concepts and analytical structures can be extrapolated generally from the social sciences of psychology and sociology and, more recently, from the physical science of boilogy. For these seventy-five years, its scientific base has gone unquestioned. Now, in urban teacher education institutions especially, we are discovering that preparing teachers for ethnic sub-cultures and minority populations requries that the teacher educator become aware of special outlooks and perspectives of various urban groups before he can educate the teacher. And these outlooks, what I call "phenomenologies," precisely because they are highly specialized and culture-based cannot be assimilated to the pursuit of general laws so typical of science. They are therefore absolutely inimical to the scientific approach to the study of education. Hence, the teacher educator's scientific house of cards comes tumbling down, and he now finds himself with a kitful of psychological, sociological, and biological concepts which are no longer relevant to his work, not because they are not true, which they are, but because they are scientific and his professional task is not. He finds himself in what I here label the "phenomenological crises," a shift in the strategies of epistemology by which teacher education is governed and directed.

Let me spell out more specifically what I think is happening.

It is no secret to anybody in the teacher education business that the establishment of education as a university discipline has been a steady struggle over the last three-quarters of a century. From Thorndike in the early years, to John Dewey and William Kilpatrick in the Twenties and Thirties through the Progressive Education movement of the Forties, through B. F. Skinner, Jerome Bruner, and Jean Piaget in the Fifties and Sixties,

the study of education has slowly and painfully gained access to the pantheon of academic disciplines in the American university.

We have all been participants in this effort and we can be reasonably proud of the achievement. But now, looking back, some troubling features of this endeavor are emerging. One that strikes me is that we made our way into the sunlight largely by convincing our academic colleagues and the American people generally that education could be treated as a science, and that human learning could be examined empirically much like physiologists study digestion or psychologists study maze-running. It is true that we have had a continuing nostalgia for so-called "individual differences" in American educational theory. But the fact is that the phenomenon of individual differences is fundamentally anti-science. Science, as an epistemology, is not interested in differences. It is interested in general tendencies, plottable regularities, and universal laws which enbrace the group, the class, the sub-set or the genus. Science is generic-prone, and it is altogether proper that it should be. For that is the great genius of science, namely, that it can lead us to understandings that cover not just an isolated instance but a whole set of instances taken together. These understandings help us manage our experience so much better, and provide the basis for science's primary advertisement for itself, namely, that is a method of knowing which makes possible "the prediction and control" of events.

One of the sad poignancies of contemporary scholarship is that the consequences of this absolute requirement of scientific epistemology--that it drives toward general laws which aid in prediction and control of experience--is not fully appreciated by our leading psychological theorists. I cite only one example, namely Carl Rogers. In a widely studied essay, "Toward a Science of the Person," he separates three kinds of knowing: subjective, objective and phenomenological. In discussing objective knowing as the paradigm of science he says:

> *Since [this mode] deals only with observable objects, the elements of any problem studied by such an approach must be treated only as publicly observable objects. Thus if I wish to study the effect upon myself of a fever-inducing drug, I observe myself as an object... Objectivity can only be concerned with objects, whether these are animate or inanimate. Conversely, this way of knowing transforms everything it studies into an ojbect, or perceives it only in its object aspects.*[1]

So true. But then the pathos of Rogers' good intentions is the occasion for heartbreak six pages later when he reveals that he himself is the captive of the objective, scientific imperium. He ruins his credibility by saying: "[The phenomenological trend in psychology] *will throw open the whole range of human experiencing to scientific study. It will explore the private worlds of inner personal meanings in an effort to discover lawful and orderly relationships there.*"[2]

So, there you have it. We are going to turn "private worlds" public; we are going to objectify inner personal meanings, single them out for analysis and then determine the laws which govern their appearance. Rogers goes on to illustrate his point by citing investigations in this kind of psychic research already underway. Finally, as a living exhibit of how a scientist can get sucked into his own predispositions, Rogers utters this puzzling closing word:

> *[T]his phenomenological-existential movement...represents a new philosophical emphasis....Man has long felt himself to be but a puppet in life...enslaved by...institutions, by the theories of psychological science. But he is firmly setting forth a new declaration of independence. He is discarding the alibis of unfreedom. He is choosing himself, endeavoring...to become himself--not a puppet, not a slave, not a machine, but his own unique individual self.*[3]

And yet, Rogers himself, just a few pages earlier, has inadvertently admitted that man is *not* unique; his inner meanings can be plotted on a graph in order to reveal laws and orderly relations of the inner life!

---

[1] T. W. Wann, *Behaviorism and Phenomenology*, Chicago: The University of Chicago Press, 1964, p. 113.

[2] *Ibid.*, p. 119

[3] *Ibid.*, p. 130

I offer Rogers as the tragic example of trying to have it both ways, of trying to have science and the free person in one and the same breath. But it cannot be done, and that is because science, simply because it *is* science, cannot know the unique person. There is no such thing as a "science of the person." It is a contradiction in terms.

But to get back to my argument and summarize my initial point: Teacher education has made its way into the university faculty club on the basis of its claim that education is a science and can be studied about and taught to prospective teachers like any other science. Accordingly, we have built our teacher education curriculums on the foundations of (a) the scientific philosophies of Pragmatism and Experimentalism, (b) the social and behavioral sciences of psychology and sociology, and more recently (c) the physical science of biology.

The practical consequences of this in schools of education is familiar to us all. Since education is a science, the phenomenon of learning (and teaching) can be viewed as more or less homogeneous throughout experience, and an individual prepared in the skills of instruction can be expected to practice education wherever children are brought together for schooling. Thus, we have come to believe that we can prepare teachers much like we prepare doctors, that is, by instructing them in the general knowledge of their craft and equipping them with general skills which can be made to apply to a relatively constant set of variables in their prospective clients.

II. THE URBAN DILEMMA

So much for history. What is the situation today? Teacher education, at least in the major universities, is inexorably becoming urban in focus. What specifically does this mean? It means, among other things, that preparing teachers for specific sub-cultures or minority populations is one of the new missions of any teacher training institution. And what we are

finding out about sub-cultures in urban America is that they are as sharply different from mainstream America as the Trobriand Islanders are from the Western Europeans. Not only that, but the outlooks and perspectives of these ethnic populations are not susceptible to the conventional canons of social science. You cannot simply take a series of Margaret Mead field trips into the black ghetto or the Spanish barrio, run exhaustive surveys on local conditions and attitudes, and write up your findings in long excursions through other people's experience. It simply won't work. Science cannot invade, let alone understand, the culture-based outlooks and perceptions of America's urban minorities. And that is because these outlooks and culture-based perceptions--what I here call "phenomenologies"--are simply not susceptible to scientific inquiry. They will not reveal themselves to the inquirer or the investigator who relies on the conventional canons of social and behavioral science. And that is because they represent a wholly new kind of knowledge which the American university is attempting to understand.

We have a dramatic, contemporary example of this: the so-called "black experience." Although blacks have known it for a long time, the remainder of society is now beginning to comprehend that the experience of being black in twentieth century America, in and of itself, is a unique psychological dynamic to which only some individuals are privy. This dynamic, this transaction between the person and his environment, leaves a deposit of awareness, although not really expressible and therefore shareable--sometimes not even among blacks themselves--is absolutely primary in the structure of a black man's knowledge. It is the ground from which all his experience is gathered in, and it therefore is absolutely necessary in understanding how a black man comes to know a world controlled by whites. At an unsophisticated level it is manifest in a black's conception of a policeman. He sees there, as few whites do, potential repression and brutality. This is his truth.

At a more sophisticated level, it is revealed in the black intellectual's demand for "black sociology" or "black psychology." The black experience tells you that social science, phenomenologically speaking, is either black or white and not the disinterested, objective, value-free "quest for truth" it has always been advertised to be.

But to bring this back to our focus on teacher education, here is the situation I am trying to describe: When we wish to prepare an individual for teaching black children, it is no longer sufficient to prepare that individual in the general knowledge of pedagogy and the technical skills of classroom instruction. A whole new kind of knowledge is called for, a new awareness, a new perception, a new outlook which lies somehow beyond the social scientist's tools of inquiry.

And let me pause right here for an extended footnote on what this new kind of knowledge is *not*. This strategic shift from scientific to phenomenological ways of knowing is not another tired allusion to C. P. Snow's two culture theory. Greater stress on the humanities, in contrast to the sciences, will get us nowhere. And that is because the humanities do not deal with what I am talking about. Although the name by which we call them sounds as if they are more "human," the humanities are like the sciences in that they are, as I have put it earlier, "generic prone." The humanities--philosophy, history, literature, religion--seek the over-all meaning of life; they stretch out in the direction of generic principles of the nature of man and the ultimate aim of the human endeavor. But I'm not talking about that.

Nor am I restating merely another version of the well known distinction between the cognitive and the affective zones of experience. Phenomenological awareness is not merely how you feel; nor is it the sum total of your emotions, in whatever array or disarray they may be in. On the contrary,

what I call one's phenomenology is the perceptual ground *out of which* one's feelings and emotions emerge and become manifest in daily experience.

Let me offer another example. Every member of a minority group--blacks, Latins, Indians, Jews, women--encounters the WASP male with a basic, built-in suspicion and distrust. This suspicion is, of course, more pronounced in some than in others, depending on heritage or personal experience, but it is an absolute constant in the perceptual outlook of every discriminated against individual. Now, this primitive form of distrust is not what I would call part of the affective life. Rather, it is what one starts with in encountering his fellow man. It is the ground out of which feelings and emotions are fashioned. Like water to a fish, it is the very medium out of which an affective life is created. Anger, hostility, frustration, pride, brotherhood, love, hate--all these are constructed out of the life lived by an individual who peers out of his world from the starting position of suspicious wariness.

To sum up, what we are after is an understanding of a new form of knowledge, namely, the set of phenomenological awarenesses each individual or sub-culture brings to the human encounter. Social science, as we have seen, turns out to be an impotent epistemology. Nor will the humanities be of much help. Finally, we are not speaking merely of affect as against cognition. I think what I am trying to penetrate is an unnamed zone of knowing which is somehow personal and private and idiomatically specific in character; it is a pre-cognitive mode of awareness which differs almost from individual to individual and which actually shapes and edits the significance of other knowledge--empirical or intuitive--which is later gathered in by the individual.

In an earlier time, we used to speak of something called "the sociology of knowledge." This concept had vague reference to the ways in which time and place have an effect on what is considered to be truth. What I am reaching for here is something we might dub "the *psychology* of knowledge." We are

discovering that knowing is a very personal act and that there is a tacit, private component in every instance of asserting that "Such and such is true." This thesis has been spelled out with great persuasion by Michael Polanyi in his book *Personal Knowledge* (New York: Harper Torchbooks, 1964). It has been extended, with her characteristic brilliance, by Marjorie Grene in the volume *The Knower and the Known* (New York: Basic Books, Inc., 1966). Now the argument is coming home to haunt the American university, dedicated for so long to the impersonal, anti-private, generic-prone quest for what Paul Goodman has called "objective consciousness."

And my point is this: As this phenomenological argument returns home to the university, it hits teacher education first, since the preparation of teachers stands in that precarious region between the social and behavioral sciences on the one hand and real world phenomenological reality on the other. We are thus caught between the classical requirements of the university--reason, disinterested criticism, and impersonal and opinion-free knowledge--and the as yet unmanageable requirements of idiosyncratic or at least sub-cultural phenomenology--awarenesses and outlooks which although learned in the street, are a form of knowledge with which the university teacher educator must deal.

III. PHENOMENOLOGY AND TEACHER EDUCATION

What is the contemporary college of education going to do about all this? for one thing, it is clear that we must gradually turn away from such heavy reliance on the conventional forms of social and behavioral science in the shaping of our discipline. There is, as we all know, a coordinate upheaval in these sciences right now; the sociologists, the anthropologists, the psychologists regularly make the headlines at their national conventions nowdays when they shout and rage at each other over how their discipline should be studied. It is possible that out of this collision of methodologies will

emerge new tools of understanding which can eventually be adopted by those of us in the study of education.

But beyond this long range hope for a solution there lie only the more immediate, pragmatic, managerial kinds of accommodations to the crisis. One of them, familiar to all of us, is the tactic of simply purchasing these elusive phenomenologies on the open market, that is, through the employment of what amounts to an "ethnic-in-residence." If you need the black perspective articulated in your work, you name more black professionals to your staff. If you need the Latin or American Indian or Oriental phenomenology in the form of a Latin or Indian or Oriental scholar. Their role is explained to them: "We want no 'house niggers' or 'coconuts' here. Rather we want you to educate the faculty in the phenomenologies you represent. Sit in our committee meetings and faculty meetings, and when you see either subtle ethno-centrism or pernicious institutional racism at work, point it out to us. Our own phenomenologies have never included these awarenesses, and we want to learn and grow in our comprehension of these perceptions."

More often than not, the ethnic response to this summons is unfriendly. "We will not," they say, "be used as institutional therapists or in-service educators of your faculty. The white man's racism is his problem, not ours. So go educate yourself, and leave us alone to get on with our own work with our own people."

I, for one, am not sure that we can take that for an answer. Admittedly, we in teacher education must now do ots of homework in what might be called "phenomenological literature." I would include under this rubric not only the specifically philosophical modes analysis as represented in the work of Polanyi and Grene, to which I have already alluded, but also the more psychological and sociological explanations in such works as Eldridge Cleaver's *Soul on Ice*, Charles Reich's *The Greening of America* and Theodore Roszak's

The Making of a Counter Culture. In these more popular arguments, we see the emergence essentially of a new kind of knowledge; there is, so to speak, a crunching forward in the American consciousness of a new state of awareness concerning the meaning of the American experience. This new consciousness has no basis in science or art or religion or politics. It is just a new and fresh way of looking at things. It does not matter whether it has been triggered by an excessive bureautechnology, or racial injustice in urban areas, or the endless slaughter in Vietnam. What does matter is that this new consciousness is a way of encountering truth, and as such, it is an imperative subject of study for the American university.

But once the homework has been done, I think the best hope for giving teacher education a phenomenological dimension is to return to the interpersonal medium. And the traffic need not be only one way. For scientists have their phenomenologies; there is a precognitive set of assumptions that every empiricist brings with him to his own research. Moreover, if the ethnic minorities have their outlooks and perceptions, so do the white majorities. If Women's Lib has its phenomenology about the sexes, then so do the male chauvinists.

Phenomenologies, after all, are not true or false. They are just there, woven into our nervous systems in such a way as to be virtually undetectable. The main thing is to share them, and in the sharing, to become aware of them ourselves. Once brought to the foreground of our attention, they can become increasingly overt in our interpersonal encounters, and we can grow and learn from them concerning the psychic needs of other people. And if the preparati of teachers is concerned with this, as it certainly is, it cannot help but be come more responsive to the requirements of all those who engage in it.

II

AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL STUDIES ASSOCIATION

STANDARDIZED TESTING IN SCHOOLS AND COLLEGES: USES AND MISUSES

John Paul Eddy
Loyola University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Abstract

This paper discusses the problems and possibilities of using selected standardized tests in elementary, secondary and higher education with particular emphasis on how such uses affect minority group students. Some standardized tests do a disservice to Indian, Spanish, Black and other minority students because these tests have a built-in cultural bias. It is this type of problem that helps explain one of the discrepancies between the total population of certain ethnic groups in proportion to their population attending schools and colleges on various levels. Misinterpretation of test scores reinforces failure and negates learning potential. Thus, the testing devices are among the factors that inhibit the education of minority group students.

A double standard operates in the use of standardized tests with college foreign students compared to citizens in this country. Students from other nations are usually given preferential treatment. On the other hand, in elementary and secondary schools there often is little awareness or understanding of test bias with respect to students from Spanish-speaking families.

Some solutions to standardized test use are: (1) Compose better tests that take into account cultural bias for each minority group. (2) Discontinue using culturally "unfair" tests as screening devices. (3) Frequently use tests in learning, e.g., curriculum. (5) Use a variety of ways and means to evaluate students for grade advancement. (6) Involve more minority students in test-making, taking, grading and evaluating. (7) Challenge test-makers with the facts on test bias. (8) Persuade educational administrators to buy better tests.

CONSCIOUSNESS III: OBSTACLE OR OPPORTUNITY?

Maxine Greene
Teachers College, Columbia University
New York City, New York

Abstract

"Consciousness III," Charles Reich's fictional construct, connects with diverse current descriptions of the thinking and value patterns characterizing the counter-culture of the young: e.g., Mead's, Keniston's, Roszak's. If we assume that there is a definable difference between the cognitive style

associated with Educational Studies and that distinctive of "Consciousness III," instructors in Educational Studies need to consider how to communicate the uses of social scientific categories and others considered appropriate to those who now reject them on principle. Integration of the field is not the only important task. There is a need to devise (and help students devise) a plurality of useful schemata for sense-making in an inchoate field. The multiplicity of forces now playing upon education must be conceptualized; policy-oriented knowledge must be sought with respect racism, elitism, poverty, and depersonalization, as well as problems more specifically centered in the schools. The student, perceived as a unique individual with a responsibility for framing plans of action (as educator, as citizen), can be enabled to define and structure situations as he himself confronts them. Disciplinary studied can be made available as possibilities for him to act upon as he identifies lacks and insufficiencies in the field.

The distinctive "consciousness" of the dissenting young may offer pedagogical opportunities we have never had before--not opportunities for identification with the young in their drive for "liberation," not opportunities for being "with it," but opportunities for choosing ourselves in good faith. True to ourselves and our own ways of seeing, we can even "love them a little." There is a similarity between the values Charles Silberman talks of persuing in the schools (spontaneity, joy in learning, a sense of self) and the values the dissenting young pursue. With some of these in mind, we can somehow learn how to move students imaginatively to extend their vision to include the past, to respond to some of the questions already burgeoning, to allow them to "do" educational history with a full consciousness of their own problematic present and in the awareness that in the course of searching they have a right to create patterns or meanings which have significance today.

Our job, after all, is to educate practitioners, activist and thoughtful human beings. Can Educational Studies be taught in ways to help students remake the order which is education by reconstituting it thoughtfully--in their own terms? The new order will be defensible; it will be warrantable if we can make available for discovery the necessary concepts, the necessary categories, the useful fictions. We cannot do this however, if we do not see what "Consciousness III" offers within our classrooms. We cannot do it if we do not choose ourselves in good faith.

A TYPOLOGY OF BIG CITY ELEMENTARY SCHOOLS

Russell C. Doll
University of Missouri
Kansas City, Missouri

Abstract

Schools in a big city are usually thought to be one of two types: "difficult" or "non-difficult" and are usually designated as such through the use of socio-economic data. The purpose of this study was to see whether

there were schools other than the dichotomous "difficult" and "non-difficult" types and whether they could be identified by other than socio-economic data.

A four term typology emerged from an analysis of interviews designed to reveal the internal conditions of the schools studied. This classification did not depend on non-school factors such as the socio-economic levels of the neighborhoods in which schools were located.

The four types of schools were assigned names according to their orientation toward instruction and control of behavior. The "non-difficult" schools (instructional orientation) were designated: Type A, Highly Academically Oriented; "difficult" schools (behavior control orientation) were designated: Type D, Highly Problem Oriented. The other intermediate type, close to the D type, was labeled: Type C, Low Academic, Semi-Problem Oriented.

Adequate functioning or dysfunctioning in the school situation seemed to be closely related to the tasks in which the teachers and principals saw themselves engaged. In Type A schools the teachers' primary tasks were related to instruction. In Type D schools the primary task was controlling children's behavior. Little effective instruction could take place. In one of the intermediate situations, Type B, the teachers were concerned primarily with instruction, but also had to do some controlling of behavior. In other intermediate situations, Type C, the teachers' concern was directed primarily towards controlling behavior, although a large amount of attention was devoted to instruction.

A checklist of representative statements was used to test the objectivity of the investigator's clinical categorizations. It was shown that teachers, in general, agreed with the investigator in the way they categorized their schools and evaluated them. The "spread" of disagreement was very small; nearly all of it was limited to a single category.

A chi square test was used to determine whether teachers tended to place their schools in the same category as did the investigator. It was used also to see whether they were able to recognize differences between their school situations and other school situations described on the check list. The results showed that teachers were able to discriminate the differences to a statistically significant degree. This finding was interpreted as confirmation of the investigator's clinical categorizations.

USING NOVELS IN EDUCATIONAL FOUNDATIONS

Kent L. Johnson
St. Paul's Lutheran Church
Lynwood, California

Abstract

The intended objective of both the liberal arts and educational foundations is the fostering of the philosophical attitude. Liberal education has traditionally had as its end the development of individuals who can deal

significantly and creatively with their life situation. Though somewhat more narrow, the role of educational foundations is similar to that of the liberal tradition in that its purpose is to nurture teachers who can relate meaningfully to their own teaching experiences. Inasmuch as the purpose of foundations is liberal, some of the materials used in classes of foundations should also be liberal in orientation.

One suggested source of such material is the general field of literature, and in particular, the novel. The novel is appealing for several reasons: it is suggestive more than declaratory; it raises questions that encourage the reader to search for more information; and, it allows the reader an opportunity to form his own beliefs and values on the basis of both cognitive and affective influences. Though the novel, in itself, may not be capable of providing the total framework for a course in foundations, it can be used to create an environment of inquiry out of which the philosophical attitude can be developed.

Thomas Hardy, the English writer of the nineteenth century, has written several excellent novels which contain many allusions to topics that are of interest to educational foundations. Throughout his novels Hardy has raised questions pertaining to: the nature and source of educational goals; theories of behavior; teacher motivation and evaluation; pressure groups and their influence upon teachers; the impact of education upon the educated; and, the relationship between student teachers and their supervisors.

Confronting these questions within the context of the hypothetical, yet intricately created, situation of the novel allows the student to search for information that will give him greater understanding of his own feelings, thoughts, and reactions to that situation. When that search results in the formulation of beliefs and values on the part of the teacher candidate, and when those beliefs are implemented in the activity of teaching, the philosophical attitude is realized and the liberal end of educational foundations is achieved.

TWO LEARNER-CENTERED EXPERIENTIAL APPROACHES TO TEACHING FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION

Gene Sullivan
University of Michigan
Flint, Michigan

Abstract

Approach I - Social and Psychological Foundations of Education: Maximum In-School Participation

Much student time in this course is spent in a school setting. Students are placed in a classroom which serves as home base. They work in the school four half-days a week for one semester. Cooperating teachers are asked to

provide students with as many experiences as the students' abilities allow. Students are briefed on the conditions of placement.

One half-day a week the students return to the campus for the "lecture-discussion" session. Nine credit hours are given on a pass-fail basis. At present, two instructors, one with social foundations background and the other with psychological foundations background, share the course responsibilities.

Initial class sessions are often open-ended discussions of first impressions and first reactions to the new environment. Examination of attitudes and feelings is given precedent over formal cognitive instruction.

The nature and order of topics are determined primarily by felt needs arising from the school experience; e.g., school discipline policy, prayers in the school, sex education, race relations, strikes, various forms of deprivation, etc. The direct day-to-day experience in the school with real problems provides starting points to be developed further in the on-campus sessions.

Approach II - Social Foundations of Education: On-Campus Course

The social foundations course, which may vary in size from 18 to 45 students in a section, meets two hours a day two days a week.

The instructor's role is described as guide, resource person or facilitator. He makes as many human and material resources available as possible. He avails insights into group dynamics and models discussion techniques.

The class is organized on the basis of study groups consisting of four to six people. A list of broad topic areas is put on the board and together the students and instructor pose a variety of questions which may be studied under one or another of the topics. Each class member is then asked to select a topic area, class members form into groups according to topic areas. Each group is allotted three to five class sessions for presentations of group work.

Presentations vary greatly from one group to another. Students are encouraged to approach topics with the learner in mind. Each group is allowed to use form of presentation that its members believe to be effective. They are constantly encouraged to think of unique ways actively to involve class members. Lectures are strongly discouraged; it is suggested that "lecture" material be duplicated and distributed.

Groups have developed a variety of ingenious presentations. For example, one group, as a part of its work on teacher organizations and negotiations, divided a class of forty-five into teacher and board teams, and simulated a negotiations session. Another group concentrating on religion and education had class members debate the issue of public funds for non-public schools. Some students who were studying the problem of dropouts interviewed dropouts in the local jail and invited high school students identified as potential dropouts to talk with the class in small discussion groups. Race relations

study groups had Ku Klux Klan members visit the class. One group made a high quality video tape of Headstart and Title I programs in local schools.

Course evaluations by students reflect an overwhelmingly positive response to an experiential approach to foundations of education.

EDUCATION: AN INTERDISCIPLINARY DISCIPLINE

Joseph L. Braga
University of Illinois
at Chicago Circle

Abstract

Education's greatest failure lies in the fact that it has not chosen to explore, incorporate, utilize and expand the concepts and values of the other social sciences. Education should be familiar with and make use of the "old" behavioral sciences: psychology, sociology, political science, anthropology, history, sign theory, game theory, decision-making theory, theory of inquiry, graph theory, cybernetics, and general systems theory. For education as a discipline is without content in and of itself; it is constructed from the content of other areas. Education should be used to bridge the communications gaps between the other behavioral sciences, and thereby, provide a means for the integration of fragmented disciplines.

In the design for education--reality, knowledge, values--the underlying force, if not the all-pervasive force, is communication. The curriculum (reality) is the "what" of communication; the teacher-learner relationship and interaction (knowledge) is the "how" of communication, and the control (values) is the "why" of communication. The ultimate aim of education is enlightenment, which leads, or should lead, to changed behavior. Enlightenment is entirely a matter of communication--communication of ideas, concepts, values.

But education has, for the most part, ignored the old as well as the new resources which would help man to solve the persistent educational problem of communication. For the practical purpose of content construction, the behavioral sciences can be subsumed under the general system of communication: cybernetics can perhaps be seen as the storage of knowledge to be communicated; group dynamics, an interactive process of communication; information theory, the measurement of communication, and so on. Education has had too little interest in advances in the new behavioral sciences. For example, curriculum-makers and other educators preach the need for linguistics in the elementary school, but with little realization of what linguistics encompasses or whether, in fact, any facet of it already exists in present-day curricula. As another example, the potential of cybernetics to aid in educational problems and to develop and advance communication is almost limitless. Machines need not be limited to the presentation of materials and the handling of examinations.

Machines can adjust their operations to the needs of individual students in much the same manner as the teacher who is cognizant of, and prepared to meet individual student's needs.

Any substantial development and extension of the teaching process through electronics must not only take into account the interrelationships of all the behavioral sciences, but must also include attention to the need for a gradual absorption into existing systems. It should be the function of the educational system of the future to develop methods that will reserve the human being for those tasks for which he is uniquely suited. Education as a discipline can only benefit from its indentification with the behavioral sciences, old and new. Education should borrow content from the other disciplines, then reorganize and reconstruct that content to provide not only a unique discipline with self-integrity, but also a discipline which overlaps and converges on all the other disciplines. Only thus can education serve the integrative function necessary to unify knowledge.

THE COMMON SCHOOL: THE CONTINUING ARGUMENT

James R. Robarts
Florida State University
Tallahassee, Florida

Abstract

The founders of the American common school developed arguments to justify the institution they were seeking to establish. They also developed arguments against private schools, for they saw these institutions as the chief obstacle to the achievement of their goals. Most of these arguments have continued in use to the present time.

The common school, as envisioned by its founders, would promote many of the goals desired by Americans: national unity, the elimination of crime, poverty, immorality and corruption in politics, the blurring of social class lines and the insurance of continuing progress towards a free, open, democratic society. Private schools were condemned for a number of reasons. They were divisive in an era when unification was critical. The patrons of private schools, generally the more affluent segments of the community, would be willing to give the common schools neither the financial nor the moral support they required. Further, they would keep out of the common schools those success-oriented children who were needed to motivate the less affluent children. The strategy that was developed to overcome private schools was simple -- make the common schools better and the private schools would soon disappear.

In recent times the common school debate has continued in essentially the same form as it was begun. Proponents of common schools such as James B. Conant and Frances Keppel give almost identical arguments for the continuing

necessity of common schools; they offer almost identical arguments against private schools. And, they even propose the same strategy for dealing with the private schools. Conant, for example, would take rising private school enrollments as a challenge to improve the public schools. He considers private schools divisive. Keppell believes that the flight of the whites from inner-city schools might be stopped and even reversed if the schools in the inner-city were made superior to those in the suburbs.

More recently, both proponents and opponents of the common schools have accepted the common school idea that children from all socioeconomic levels should be "mixed" in schools. Joseph Alsop, writing about ghetto schools, speculates that such a desirable "mix" might just possibly be achieved -- even in ghetto schools -- if they were reformed radically enough. Christopher Jencks also supports the desirability of a "mix", but believes that publicly subsidized private schools would be more likely to achieve this than would the public schools.

Peter Schrag, writing in the September, 1970, issue of the Saturday Review announced the death of the common school and with it the American dream of equality and opportunity. To restore the dream, alternatives to public education must be reestablished. Schrag believes the voucher plan offers the best hope for achieving this. In the same journal, President John Fischer of Teachers College reaffirms the need for the common school. While admitting that much of the criticism of public education is valid, and admitting also the need for radical reform, he contends that education is too important to be left to "the uncertain enthusiasm of voluntary enterprise." He insists that the public schools be strengthened, reformed and preserved no matter what else happens. Thus the argument continues in the 1970's in much the same terms as it was begun in the 1830's.

EXPERIENCING FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION

Val Rust
University of California
Los Angeles, California

Abstract

Education in contemporary society must be brought into harmony with the social structure in which youthful learning processes thrive. These processes have ceased to be unilinear and concentrate largely upon involving cooperative group endeavors. The content and process of educational foundations aims at awareness of the ways in which attitudes and behavior of young people are being shaped, and the kinds of school environments which are appropriate. Such awareness is only possible by engaging ourselves and our students in these processes. Accordingly, the foundations course described below is largely experimental with discussions arising almost exclusively out of individual, classroom, and community involvement.

The course focus is on three main areas. First, we concentrate on the formation and productive maintenance of the class as a group. If we are successful, group members become mutually responsible for their conduct and performance. Experiences are shared and new experiences are generated. The whole process by which this takes place is also an important subject for inquiry and understanding.

Second, the student is assisted toward a greater sensitivity and understanding of the broader social dynamic within which teaching takes place. Students engage in community projects related to education, and they participate in school environments which deviate from traditional institutions. Traditional institutions are viewed as largely dysfunctional in contemporary society.

Third, students begin to relate their own talents, interests, dilemmas or problems to education in general. Out of their varied backgrounds come creative experiences significant both for individual and group learning.

All components of the course fuse into an organic whole, each element contributing to and enhancing all others. Teacher initiated activities of the course become self-generating until the last half of the course is almost entirely in the hands of the group as a whole.

AMERICAN PUBLIC EDUCATION AS AN INSTITUTION OF SOCIAL CONTROL

Yale Lee Mandel
University of Texas
Austin, Texas

Abstract

This study explores the possibility that public education in America serves, and may be intended to serve, as an instrument of social control. Major implications of this hypothesis include the following: (1) that education seeks to maintain the economically and culturally different in their current social position; (2) that it operates as a working and effective tool of the white middle class; and further, (3) that its purpose is economically and social class value-oriented and motivated.

The school controls, through staff and program, what it transmits. In this way it influences ideology and outlook. Hence, those who hold those ideologies or outlooks are to a degree controlled. The formal school program transmits culture in the basic curriculum and attitudes and values in such courses as history, American problems, literature and art. Through cultural transmission a "design for living" or value pattern is developed which to a great degree determines actions, reactions, goals and attitudes.

The school imparts and supports conformity by virtue of its authority and powers -- physical, moral, and legal. The school physically controls its charges by power of its unique position of being in loco parentis. The school's moral authority and the position of its teachers and administrators also act to instill conformity. The school's premise for existing is to implant "mass" education. In any "mass" system the individual is necessarily subjugated. The student must conform to the majority will and the position of his superior. The principal or guidance counsellor must assume that the teacher is correct and the student wrong. To do otherwise would be to sanction the student's behavior, his real or imagined deviancy, presumably to the utter destruction of the mass system or society.

Any institution or apparatus for social control must employ some boundaries or limits, however arbitrary, which control is intended to maintain or define. These limits or values are a product of the group or groups which the institution serves. Since, to a large extent, the school is a mirror of the society, it seeks to maintain the values and attitudes, the norms, mores and folkways of the society. In our society these values are middle class, white and predominatly Protestant.

That a large part of the school's control rationale is economically based cannot be doubted. This follows from the fact that our industrialized, technological society does not contain job opportunities for adolescents. Other than the armed forces, there is no meaningful or dignified work available to the adolescents from qualifying for, and competing in the job market.

We eliminate children by placing them in stifling educational tracks as early as age six. We have developed I.Q. tests, reading readiness programs and ability groups that lead to this end. The disappearance of jobs for youth has left the adolescent with no role other than student.

Cultural transmission has always been considered a prime function of education. It is only logical that a social institution like education should carry on and transmit the dominant values in the culture.

The schools cannot favor or promote diversity of response or behavior in its students without putting into peril the "common" culture core upon which the society operates.

ANOTHER RENAISSANCE?

Claire L. Gilles
Kutztown State College
Kutztown. Pa.

Abstract

Critical moments in man's history generate philosophy. An example of such a time in the West is that of Socrates; and in the East, that of Confucius.

It is difficult to recognize the moment of change at the time it is in progress. There is evidence that we are currently in such a time. Parallels can be seen between the time of the Old Renaissance (post-Middle Ages) and the New Renaissance (our time).

For the purpose of comparison, the following are some of the points considered: the pace and the method of change, the role of religion, the shift from nationalism to individualism, the nature of man, the rise of the common man, emphasis upon the immediate, the need for action, attitude towards This World and Next World concerns, technological developments, education, the family, the relation between humanism and science, the search for truth.

The young people of the New Renaissance are urged to view their self-appointed role of world-corrector, not in isolation, which results in feelings of alienation and self-defeating acts, but rather as the vital expression of a proud cultural tradition. They are cautioned against abandoning themselves to emotionalism, and are advised to use in the social realm the tool inherited from the Old Renaissance, namely scientific method.

Youth of the New Renaissance are commended for their concern with social problems and their optimism in the possibility of social improvement.

For us today, poised between the past and the future, the question is whether we can analyze the present sufficiently well to control the forces that move us--or will those forces, without our understanding or desire, prove inexorable in their self-determination?

EDUCATION AS PSYCHOTHERAPY

Elmer N. Lear
Pennsylvania State University
Capitol Campus, Middletown

Abstract

The notion that education is to be treated as psychotherapy today enjoys considerable currency. An able exponent of this viewpoint is the social psychologist Arthur J. Brodbeck. Brodbeck's basic postulate is that the prevailing disjunction between cognition and affect is factually insupportable and philosophically unwarranted. This paper seeks to expound the supporting ideas underlying Brodbeck's main position. It then offers a critique, directing attention to certain inconsistencies and inadequacies in Brodbeck's psychotherapeutic pedagogy.

A key concept in Brodbeck's analysis is "value." The paper takes up this term, showing how it functions as "multivaluedness" in the development of both democratic institutions and a democratic individual character. Brodbeck's major and reiterated allegation is that the social sciences are delinquent in not having investigated the crucial role played by "mood and feeling" associated with value in the formation of democratic character. From his

standpoint, the claim that the social sciences are "value'free' is a myth, sometimes deliberately promoted by those social science practitioners who aspire to wider political influence. What Brodbeck demands is an approach to social science that eschews arid, intellectual pseudo-objectivity in favor of fully disclosing the inner experiential dimensions of creative research. Analysis of aesthetic experience is essential in shedding light upon the true complementarity of cognition and affect. Thus, the "theatre of the absurd" endeavors to confront the personality disorientation and social value confusion bulking large in contemporary life.

Turning to pedagogy, Brodbeck regards character education as of cardinal importance. He advocates an expansion of "consciousness" -- a subject appropriately studied by an educational psychology taking due account of value and mood. He would have educators supply exemplars of "ethical heroism," people personifying "a more perfected use of consciousness." He would commence his education for virtue as early as infancy, insisting that much learning takes place at this stage. He also expresses a strong preference for "romanticism" as opposed to "classicism" in education, attacking the latter for ever-stressing cognition.

Too much of education, Brodbeck declares, is freightened with anxiety-producing situations. Brodbeck would inaugurate an era of joyfulness in education. Such a sweeping change could come about if the resources of social psychology were to be made available for research into the mood conditions under which learning for character development occurs. What educators must do is to capitalize upon the connectedness of learning and mood. Brodbeck offers some suggestions.

THE "BLACK STATUS" OF TEACHER EDUCATION IN ACADEMIA (AN ACADEMIC RIGHTS MOVEMENT)

Jack K. Campbell
Texas A & M University
College Station, Texas

Abstract

Teacher education has too long been separate and unequal in the liberal arts society of higher education. Its "Black Status" is an issue that divides and weakens the whole enterprise of learning. Academic status, traditionally reserved for scholarly and theoretical disciplines, is coming under attack on all fronts. Should the public demand simple, practical applications of all disciplines, as it does for teacher education, the pursuit of truth in all fields would be threatened. Moreover, the inferior status of teacher education has an impact on learning as well as on the institutions of learning. Implications from the "Coleman Report" tend to relate achievement to the attitude of students about the "superior" or "inferior" status of their school.

Teacher training, once reserved for slaves, later segregated in "inferior" normal schools, is still struggling for equal academic rights. Its rights have been thwarted all along because it has not been considered a separate or equal discipline. More recently it has received much academic interest, but this trend is only integration at the hands of academic carpetbaggers. If education is worthy of academic study, why should it not be worthy of separate study by a separate faculty?

Separate study of education can only achieve equal status if it meets the undergraduate requirements for a major! Its vocational aspects should be reserved for another area of the university. No multiplication of courses for a major in Educational Studies would be necessary if its basic core of study were related to an elected concentration in some other academic area. The basic core of studies would carry the "structure" and "taxonomies" of knowledge through the conditions of learning to the concepts of intelligence, stressing all along such things as information processing, techniques of transmitting and transforming culture, methods of inquiry and verification. Such a major would be as useful as any of the liberal arts; it would finally give education its own separate identity; and, it would attract those who have long resisted the study of education because of its low vocational pay and status.

Education, we are told, is the "growth industry" of the future. Information processing is the sine qua non of modern civilization, and human engineering is even more vital for its survival. This is the scope of Educational Studies. Graduates with this major would have one foot in the professional door, but would also be equal to other liberal arts graduates in competing for careers in any sector of the economy or public service.

SOME ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS FOR FOUNDATIONS OF EDUCATION

Janice Farmer Weaver
Glassboro State College
New Jersey

Abstract

The paper is a sociological discussion of Foundations of Education, its present status in academe generally, and in professional education specifically. Questions are formulated to focus upon specific social, financial, and institutional pressures affecting what often appear to be matters of academic substance and quality. Major questions raised are:

1. Can substantive issues be resolved and institutional roles restructured in accordance with the resolution?

2. Are difficulties in defining expertise in Foundations of Education different from difficulties of other academic studies?

3. How can Foundations of Education remain responsive to local needs while becoming more uniform in expertise?

4. Should Foundations of Education become part of general education and not continue as one component in teacher preparation?

5. Should Foundations of Education personnel seek a detente with other professional educators?

6. Is necessary academic refinement sufficient for survival of Foundations of Education as distinct areas of study?

In conclusion, there is a call for careful descriptive studies of what is taught in the name of Foundations. Such study may be related to appropriate institutional, academic, and societal developments in an attempt to isolate or delineate the role of Foundations of Education for the future.

ANTHROPIDIOLOGY: A NEW DISCIPLINE

Phillip T. McClung
California State Polytechnic College
San Luis Obispo, California

Abstract

Man possesses animalistic and mechanistic traits, but he also possesses qualities which make him distinctively human. There is a need for a deliberate, concerted effort at identifying and teaching about those qualities and characteristics of man which are uniquely human. A new discipline, anthropidiology, is proposed to help man learn about his own uniqueness and what it means to be genuinely, distinctively human. Anthropidiology is defined as the study of that which is unique about man.

If a trait is to be identified as uniquely human, it must be universally applicable and be found exclusively in homo sapiens. Man's unique characteristics can be divided into those which are necessary or inescapable and those which are optional. There is already a vast amount of knowledge about man scattered throughout separate disciplines. Each of these disciplines in invited to contribute whatever information it may have gleaned to the synthesizing discipline of anthropidiology.

Some examples of man's necessary characteristics are: (1) learning in massive doses and at a rapid rate, (2) symbolic communication, (3) vicarious experience, (4) transcendence of both time and space, (5) capacity for being deceived, and (6) lifelong awareness of impending death.

Man's optional characteristics can be illustrated by: (1) activism in causing change, (2) cooperativeness, (3) capacity for empathy, (4) desire for and power to organize and discard or destroy patterns of governance,

(5) experiencing emotions such as guilt, regret, suspicion and anxiety, (6) actively seeking out experiences of suffering and sorrow, (7) capacity for torturing other organisms, (8) non-procreative sexual activities, and (9) capacity for murder in the form of senseless assassination or wanton killing on a mass scale even by remote control.

It is suggested that anthropidiological knowledge needs to be disseminated by parents in the home, at elementary and secondary levels of formal education, and be represented in higher education as a recognized academic discipline. National and international program of anthropidiological information might serve to reduce social, racial and national tensions.

Anthropidiology extends an open invitation to all disciplines to make whatever contributions they may have to offer to enlighten man about himself and his distinctiveness. It will always remain a perpetually open-ended discipline, welcoming additions to its content whenever new facets of man's uniqueness come to light. The content of anthropidiology will never be obsolete -- at least, no more obsolete than man himself.

III

COMPARATIVE AND INTERNATIONAL EDUCATION SOCIETY

A MODEL FOR THE DEVELOPMENT OF MIDDLE-LEVEL SKILLED MANPOWER IN EMERGENT NATIONS

Susanne M. Shafer
Arizona State University, Tempe

Abstract

The proposed model for the development of middle-level skilled manpower in emergent nations is derived from procedures used to that end in three modern nations, viz., the United States, West Germany, and the Soviet Union. Some of the characteristics incorporated into the model include: (1) polytechnic education in the U. S. S. R., (2) the West German combination apprenticeship and part-time vocational education whereby adolescent school-leavers are absorbed into the labor market, and (3) the American freedom of vocational choice and of repeated access to the several levels of education throughout much of life. The design also takes into account existing educational, economic and socio-political problems in emergent nations which now interfere with the development of middle-level skilled manpower.

Major recommendations are that (1) differentiation between elementary and secondary and between academic and skills education be minimized by means of polytechnic education; (2) parent education should be concurrent with the education of children; (3) training opportunities should be continuously available as an individual moves along in his occupation; (4) apprenticeship education coupled with vocational and general education should be part of the process of graduating youth from school into available openings in the labor market; (5) emergent nations' manpower needs should be monitored, publicized, and interpreted in the policies and programs of technical-vocational training facilities; (6) instruction at these institutions should be individualized and accompanied by personal and career counseling; (7) the economic reward system should be graded on a scale that accords the highest compensation for useful innovations and work most needed for the development of the society; and (8) women should increasingly be trained into the rank of skilled labor as population controls effectively limit family size.

The actual model proposes that middle-level skilled manpower be developed through (A) basic literacy and skills, or polytechnic education for children; (B) extended general education linked with polytechnic and apprenticeship education for adolescents; and (C) training and retraining at urban education complexes for adult workers as they move along in life and career.

THE FALLACY CONCERNING THE OUTCOME OF COMPREHENSIVE EDUCATION AS A POLITICAL ISSUE IN GREAT BRITAIN

Stephen P. Heyneman
Comparative Education Center
University of Chicago

Abstract

Effects of comprehensive education are misunderstood, and political energy is misspent on the separate school issue. There are three misunderstandings. First, comprehensive education in this country and elsewhere has failed to produce the egalitarian results in academic achievement expected of it. Second, and more important, is the issue of class streaming. Yet even in ability-mixed classrooms, the crucial question is not the introduction of ability or cultural heterogeneity, but the proportions within heterogenous groupings. Too much working-class representation in elite schools may institutionalize the achievement and value patterns common to working-class schools. But there would be less chance of this occurring in elite institutions than in comprehensive schools.

Third, where children from heterogenous backgrounds are placed together, there is no reason to believe that they will mix and share values and friendships at randon. There is some evidence to suggest that friendship patterns are closely related to class background, and that the children of manual-worker or non-manual-worker home environments would be as separate as they have been under the bi- or tri-partite systems.

Three hypothetical methods for achievement democratization might be considered. (1) A grammar school quota system could insure a representative proportion of working class children in elite institutions. Careful attention, however, would have to be paid to the potential diminution of academic quality likely to follow any selection based upon non-achievement criteria. (2) On the other hand, early testing at age six might insure a more democratic representation within the high ability group by avoiding the numerous environmental factors between age six and age eleven which mitigate against working class achievement. But to institute early testing would require the dissipation of "1984" concerns. Correlatively, it would also be necessary to obtain more experience in large scale testing of young children.

Finally, (3) proportional classroom mixing might be considered. In any proportional mix the question of a "critical mass" must not be overlooked, if maximum achievement value sharing is an aim. Clearly, then, the only functional suggestions for more democratic representation of the nation's elite are (a) the quota system, which is subject to problems of quality maintenance, or (b) early testing, with its difficulties of acceptance and test imperfections.

Effects of comprehensive education are misunderstood, and political energy is misspent on the separate school issue. There are three major misunderstandings. First, comprehensive education in this country and elsewhere has failed to produce the egalitarian results in achievement expected of it. Second, and possibly more important, is the issue of class streaming. Yet, even in ability-mixed classrooms, the crucial question is not the introduction of heterogeneity, whether of ability or culture, but the proportions within heterogeneous groupings. Too much working-class representation in elite schools may institutionalize the achievement and other value patterns common to working-class schools. There would be less likelihood of this occurring in elite institutions than in comprehensive schools.

A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF URBAN AND RURAL TEACHER ROLES IN A CHANGING SOCIETY: LEBANON

Suzanne Howard
University of Kentucky

Abstract

To implement aims, policy-makers in education and development are required to make decisions concerning the assignment of new roles, positions, and interactions. For that purpose, it is necessary to know which roles are under stress and tension during a period of social change. Information on existing roles and how they are performed should help to provide the knowledge necessary to implement policies whereby educators might formalize and legitimize new roles.

The study focused on teacher roles as influenced by French education in both urban and rural Christian (Maronite) communities. Two schools, College de la Sagesse (Beirut) and Saint Maron (Majdel-Meouche), were selected to represent, respectively, the urban and rural sub-samples. A Q-sort technique was employed to elicit data on expectations from four groups of respondents: administrators, teachers, students, and parents. Forty expectation items representing microscopic acts and attributes were categorized into eleven teacher roles, e.g., mediator of learning, confidant. Data on the role performance of teachers were collected through the conventional participant-observer technique, informants, systematic observations of classrooms, and unstructured interviews.

The questions which guided the study were the following:

1. What similarities and differences are there in expectations for the role of the teacher between and within the various groups in the study?

2. What is the rank order of teacher roles on a scale ranging from least important to most important?

3. To what extent do subjects agree in their rank orderings of the teacher roles?

4. Are there discrepancies between ideal behavior, i.e., expectations, and actual behavior with respect to the role of the teacher?

Results

1. A two-way analysis of variance performed on the group means for the teacher role expectations revealed few significant differences related to (1) location, (2) position, or (3) a combination of both.

2. A high degree of agreement was found among the various groups on the question of ideal roles of the teacher.

3. Similarly, with regard to actual role behavior, few urban-rural differences appeared. The rural teacher's role, however, tended to be somewhat diffuse while the urban teacher performed a more particularistic assignment.

4. Comparison of discrepancies between ideal and actual teacher behavior in both urban and rural settings indicated that urban and rural aspirations for the teacher were similar. There was a common desire to move from a particularistic role performance to a more diffuse role as typified by the role performance of teachers in more developed, industrialized societies, e.g., the Soviet Union, the United States.

5. Role theory can contribute to social change theory; it is a valuable tool by which to identify directions and potentials of change.

Conclusions

Observations of teacher behavior revealed that teachers assumed an authoritarian leadership role suited to the preservation of social continuity and stability. However, the role expectations defined in this study suggest that teachers need to be familiar with a new educational outlook. By allowing teachers more latitude for action, and by providing direct reinforcement for alternative actions, it may be possible to train teachers to function as agents of change in developing societies.

THE UNIVERSITY PROFESSOR IN LATIN AMERICA: A NEW LOOK AT AN OLD STEREOTYPE

Richard Pelczar
University of Illinois
Urbana, Illinois

Abstract

Higher education in Columbia, South America has recently experienced rapid expansion, both horizontal and vertical differentiation, and a movement toward a full-time teaching staff. These changes have given rise to new expectations for the role of the university professor while simultaneously changing its structure. Despite such reforms in Columbia and elsewhere, a negative and stereotyped image of the professor has persisted in the literature on the Latin American university. According to this view, he is a prestige-seeking full-time professional who teachers a few hours a week, but is little interested in his pedagogical responsibilities, contributions to knowledge, or in the life of the university.

To test whether the professional role has in fact changed, one hundred and ninety professors from six universities in the city of Medellin were interviewed concerning their role contexts and conceptions, career patterns, teaching methods and performance in such role related activities as research

publications, administration and extension. In this essay the responses of the part- and full-time professors have been juxtaposed and contrasted with the hypothetical behavioral characteristics of the stereotyped image of the university professor portrayed in literature.

The three way comparison demonstrates that a transformation of the academic role is underway. Not only are the contemporary professors in a more differentiated role contest than the simple part/time full-time dichotomy suggests, but they view university teaching as a vocation and have followed career patterns very different from those suggested by the old stereotype. Similarly, the majority prefer to identify themselves as educators or university professors, and define their role as principally involving the orientation and formation of students.

With regard to performance in role related activities, the full-time professors consistently fared better than their part-time counterparts on indices gauging teaching methods, research productivity, disciplinary participation and university activities. Both part- and full-time professors did better than predictions based on the old stereotype image would have indicated, even though performance in many of these areas leaves much to be desired.

The results reflect the fact that incentives for contributions to knowledge are all but nonexistent, and sanctions such as "publish or perish" have yet to be institutionalized. On the other hand, the professors' responses communicate a strong student-centered quality coupled with an orientation toward social activism. The latter are indicative of the perceptible changes the academic role has undergone and are likely to influence its development in the near future.

TIES BETWEEN AMERICAN EDUCATIONAL PRAGMATISM AND THE SOKA GAKKAI MOVEMENT OF JAPAN

Dayle M. Bethel
Graceland College

Abstract

A little known Japanese teacher, Tsunesabure Makiguchi, who lived and taught in Japan prior to World War II, is emerging today as a significant contributor to educational thought in the twentieth century. Early in his youth Makiguchi became deeply concerned about the personality stifling effect of traditional Japanese education on children. This concern led him to spend nearly forty years of his life in Japanese education as a teacher, administrator, and writer. In his search for ideas to assist in his efforts at educational and social reform Makiguchi read widely. He was particularly drawn to the writings of two American pragmatists, Lester Ward and John Dewey. The sociological concepts of Ward and the educational pragmatism of Dewey became key elements in a unique educational philosophy which he called his philosophy of value and value creating pedagogy. This philosophy and pedagogy is most fully revealed in his major work, Soka Kyoikugaku Taikei (System of Value Creating Pedagogy), which he published in four volumes between the years 1930 and 1934. Makiguchi looked on his work as an indigenous Japanese philosophy of education.

Although Makiguchi had a number of well known and competent supporters who encouraged him in his work and assisted him in his efforts at reform, his educational ideas were rejected by Japanese society. After devoting most of a lifetime to the task of bringing about change in Japan's tradition bound system of education, Makiguchi had to face the hard reality that he had failed. It was during this period that he became preoccupied with the absolutist teachings of Nichiren Shoshu, a militant sect of Japanese Buddhism. It seems likely that his growing interest in and reliance on religion at this time was related to the sense of frustration and futility which accompanied the recognition of his powerlessness to bring about change in Japanese education and society through educational means.

The reform movement which Makiguchi organized during the 1930's under the name Soka Kyoiku Gakkai (Value Creating Education Society) was reconstructed after the war at Soka Gakkai (Value Creating Society). Today Soka Gakkai is implementing Makiguchi's educational ideas both in the development of its internal educational processes and in the formal educational institutions which it has founded in Japanese society. These educational ideas and methods of Makiguchi's are believed to be a significant factor in the postwar success of the movement.

IV

HISTORY OF EDUCATION SOCIETY

MEN AND EVENTS: WILLIAM WIRT, THE BLUFFTON YEARS

Walter H. Drost
Milwaukee, Wisconsin

Abstract

Rather than any particular event, the social change from a rural-agrarian to an urban industrial society was the most important feature of life to educational innovators at the turn of the century. Education for social efficiency was the most common response to the challenge of this change. The proposals of David Snedden, using techniques of job analysis to identify the new content of instruction, organized into "lotments" of learning, then grouped into "strands" calculated to produce specific types of competence, were of lasting significance. One has but to look at the proposals of the ES'70s, with learning Activities Packages and Specific Performance Objectives, to find a remarkably similar innovation.

William Wirt's Gary Plan, built upon the ideals of William Morris, was quite different. It aimed to provide an environment where the joy of work would be fostered for purposes of self-fulfillment rather than utilitarian competence. A large segment of the population, especially in the Middle West, found in the home-spun philosophy and pithy writing of Elbert Hubbard an acceptable interpretation of the changing society. Hubbard made a generous appropriation of the ideals and life-style of Morris, focusing on the enobling qualities of handwork rather than his rejection of mechanization. In developing his plan, Wirt was stimulated by the example of Hubbard's Roycroft institution as well as Morris' writings. He pioneered a manual -arts program based upon these ideals in the schools of Bluffton, Indiana. He visited Roycroft shops at East Aurora, New York and, to motivate his students, brought back some of the handcrafts produced there. His work at Bluffton gained him statewide reputation and won for him the superintendency of the Gary schools.

At Gary, because the population grew more rapidly than tax assessments, Wirt had to concern himself with economy of operation. In order to provide an enriched program, he developed the plan of the platoon school. His most extensive program, that of the Froebel School, served the most disadvantaged segment of the Gary community. Under Wirt, the schools of Gary exercised a social control function over the parents as well as the children to make acceptable a life-style that William Morris, himself, had rejected.

THOMAS McCULLOCH AND THE PICTOU ACADEMY CONTROVERSY: MAN AND EVENTS ASSESSED

J. Bruce Roald
Dalhousie University
Halifax, Nova Scotia, Canada

Abstract

The extent of control an individual may have over the events of his career is difficult to assess. Many factors intervene in the equation

of man to events: among these, the personality of the individual and the nature of opposing interests. Probably no man consciously controls his own destiny; probably too, no man's career is completely a product of fate or chance. Because of his personality or because of needs of which he is scarcely aware, a man may inhibit the achievement of his conscious goals. So it seems to be with Dr. Thomas McCulloch, the subject of this case study.

Shortly after he arrived in 1803 at Pictou in the colony of Nova Scotia, McCulloch began a life-long struggle to create an Academy. Pictou Academy, eventually incorporated in 1816, was to embody McCulloch's educational vision: a college open to all regardless of religion and leading to careers determined by talent alone. For McCulloch, the college was to serve two additional purposes: one, it was to be a means of weakening the educational primacy of King's College and of diminishing the social ascendancy of the Anglican Tories within the colony; two, it was to provide Presbyterians, particularly Secession Presbyterians, with a natively educated clergy.

Pictou Academy soon encountered opposition from two somewhat divergent groups. The appointed Executive Council, the Anglican dominated upper branch of the colonial government, viewed the college as a threat to their pre-eminence in the colony's political, social, educational, and religious life. Ministers of the established Church of Scotland also saw Pictou Academy as a threat: for them, it seemed to promise an eventual victory of Secession belief in the colony. Both groups sought every opportunity to diminish the Academy's effectiveness and to discredit McCulloch. The result was that they embroiled McCulloch and the Academy in constant controversy--over which he seemed to have little control.

This, however, is an incomplete picture. McCulloch was a man molded by struggle, for whom constant challenge was necessary. Rarely avoiding debate and controversy, McCulloch consciously sought polemical contests. He was a stern, self-righteous man who often offended more than he pleased. He was a chief contributor to the controversy over his Academy; he intensified, not lessened, the opposition to it. Hence, he presents a curious paradox: a man who spent his life pursuing a goal, but whose temperament hindered its achievement. McCulloch is a classic example of the historian's dilemma in attempting to establish the extent of control a complex individual may have over apparent events.

EVENTS AND THE MAN: GEORGE S. COUNTS AND DARE THE SCHOOL BUILD A NEW SOCIAL ORDER?

Gerald L. Gutek
Loyola University of Chicago
Chicago, Illinois

Abstract

John Dewey's description of experience, found in Experience and Education, was used as a frame of reference to examine George S. Counts'

Dare the School Build a New Social Order? According to Dewey, an experience involves: (1) an experimental continuum; (2) an interaction between the person and the environment. The "internal conditions" of experience are found in an individual's needs, desires, purposes, and capacities; the "external" or "objective conditions" are environmental and include that which interacts with the experiencing subject. An historical event, such as Counts' Dare the School?, involves an interaction between these sets of conditions.

By using his published works to establish the internal conditions of experience relative to Dare the School Build a New Social Order?, it can be seen that Counts had moved to a decidedly socially-oriented view of education in the decade preceding the Depression of the 1930's. His socio-educational perspective included such elements as: (1) a commitment to an egalitarian conception of democratic education which opposed selection based on socio-economic class or race; (2) a belief that education was intimately related to social, economic, and political forces; (3) a recognition that upper socio-economic classes dominated schooling; (4) a belief that Americans had simplistically equated schooling and education as intrinsically good and isolated from social conflicts; (5) a recognition that a technological society had emerged as a result of the scientific and industrial revolutions; (6) a conviction that social, political, economic, and educational institutions had failed to deal with an emergent technological civilization.

Educational historians have generally interpreted Counts' Dare the School? as part of the context of the Depression of the 1930's. The objective conditions of the Depression era are well-known: massive unemployment, popular rejection of the political and business leaders associated with the prosperity of the 1920's, educational retrenchment, and a loss of faith in democratic institutions and processes. In 1932, in "Dare Progressive Education Be Progressive?" and later enlarged his audience to include the teachers of the nation in Dare the School Build a New Social Order?

EVENTS AND THE MAN

Maxine Greene
Teachers College
Columbia University
New York City, New York

Abstract

Caught up in the stream of events, the men who have changed American education have known how to swim consciously with the stream, how to be actors rather than spectators. They have been men who knew that the way things happen is to a large -degree subject to human choice. The traditional teleological approach to educational history obscured the role of judgment and choice; but it is now possible to think in terms of multiple processes and transactions, including conscious individual acts.

It is possible, too, to study the ways in which educational leaders structured their conceptions of things, to see how their structuring related to the life of ideas in their time--indeed, to restore the history of educational thought to its proper place in the history of ideas.

As important is a consideration of the relation between expressed beliefs and practical judgments, between individual "readings" of events and the thoughts of other men with different orientations, different idioms, different standpoints in society.

Horace Mann, for instance, was a fallible man, choosing among diverse alternatives, obviously unable to encompass all dimensions of the situations he confronted, yet committing himself (as best as he could) to particular actions at different moments of time. It would be useful to try, from the vantage point of our own freedom, to clarify some of the decisions made by Mann and other free men of the past. We might do so by situating ourselves imaginatively in their complex worlds, by focusing on men-in-situations, recapturing from the prespective of the present.

The objective is to push back the boundaries of the situations in which our own decision-making takes place, to create an increasingly meaningful context in which to meet the problems of today. To focus on our precursors in their freedom and fallibility is to impose a meaning on history which does not include the meanings made possible by explanatory generalizations and studies of trends. We can, after all, be both hedgehogs and foxes. The point is to treat history of education in its multiple entanglements with society and to become more conscious of what we ourselves are doing by studying the lives of men who chose themselves within the stream.

THE SOCIETY OF PROFESSORS OF EDUCATION

Founded 1902

Officers and Executive Committee 1971-72

President
Glen Hass
College of Education
University of Florida
Gainesville, Florida 32601

Immediate Past President
Robert H. Beck
College of Education
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Vice President (President 1972-73)
Van Cleve Morris
College of Education
University of Illinois
at Chicago Circle
Chicago, Illinois 60680

Secretary-Treasurer
Roberta Bayles
College of Education
Atlanta University
Atlanta, Georgia 30314

Ann R. Gayles
School of Education
Florida A & M University
Tallahassee, Florida 32307

Robert R. Reilly
College of Education
University of Arkansas
Fayetteville, Arkansas 72701

A. L. Sebaly
Western Michigan University
Kalamazoo, Michigan 49001

Archivist
Ayers Bagley
College of Education
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

Professional and Public Relations
James K. Uphoff
Education Department
Wright State University
Dayton, Ohio 45431

Publications Business Manager
Frank R. Braun
College of Education
University of Minnesota
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55455

SPE Headquarters Office
Suite 610
One Dupont Circle
Washington, D. C. 20036